CHRISTENDOM

VOLUME XIII SPRING, 1948 NUMBER 2

LETTER FROM/TO GERMANY

BY STEWART W. HERMAN

THE other day I received a most disturbing letter from a good friend of mine in the British Zone of Germany. During a recent visit to England he had taken advantage of the opportunity to enquire at Australia House regarding the possibility of immigration. Although he knew that I would thoroughly disapprove of his plan, he wanted me to understand his desire to get away from Germany. He wrote:

> You will remember that I wanted to go to the U.S.A. as an exchange student in 1938, but was not allowed to do so. I meant to stay there. I was sick of Nazi Germany then. And when I look at Germany now, nothing has changed. The corruption among German authorities is getting worse and worse. The "de-Nazification" has become "re-Nazification." The English are trying their very best to help, yet they get the blame even from intelligent people for the present need. When I tell my countrymen what I think about these affairs, they call me "pro-British" and think I am a suspicious character. I was a suspicious character under the Nazis, I am a suspicious character now. I have become even more suspicious now because I was allowed to go to England. Well, Stewart, can you understand that I am sick of these people here? And that I should like to get out as soon as possible? Moreover, when you see nothing but ruins around you, when you see that the God of the people has become the Belly, . . . well, it does not make you feel any better. I wish you were here and I could talk these things over with you.

Peter — let's call him that — was told that he may have to wait five years before he can move to Australia. He also discovered that Roman Catholic applications, for some reason, are receiving priority attention. Meanwhile he will continue to live with his wife and baby in a badly-damaged house near Cologne. Where the second floor used to be, he is cultivating a vegetable garden. In spite of the fact that he has a fairly good salary as a surgeon, there is little hope of a real career which

will enable him in the next twenty years to provide his wife with a comfortable home. To have more children is out of the question. Peter is losing not only his hopes which blossomed when Hitler fell, but he is also in danger of losing his faith.

(Now, Peter — although that is not your name — I am going to reply to you in an "open letter" and I hope you will forgive me for publishing parts of yours. I do it because I think your story will interest a lot of Christians over here and help them to understand your predicament. My version of your life may help you in some measure to see the larger issues which confront us all.)

Perhaps I should not have said that Peter is in danger of losing his faith. His faith has actually been growing. There was a time, several years ago, when religion meant very little to him, although — like most Germans — he had been baptized and confirmed in the church. Hitlerism did not offend his religious principles so much as it violated his strong sense of human dignity and personal independence. The Brown Shirts, to Peter, were stupid and brutal clowns. Their totalitarian pretensions amounted to an idiotic joke. He loved to outwit the Nazis and for many years he succeeded. He evaded military service and, when war finally came, succeeded in staying out of uniform until the very last year.

Peter's respect for the church grew slowly. He saw Christian ministers daring to resist and he admired them for their personal courage. To his way of thinking such men were exceptions, but the church as an institution was too weak to be effective and most of the church members were merely hyprocrites. The real reason why Peter first came to the American Church in Berlin was to learn English during the tea hours in the library. He learned very quickly and was well liked for his politeness and helpfulness. He was also ambitious, and finally decided to study medicine even though he had no financial backing. At the University of Berlin he passed his courses with flying colors, while busily inventing thousands of reasons for being excused from Nazi student activities.

Although Peter attended services with clock-like regularity, he never came to communion. He had been confirmed in a nearby German church several years before by a pastor whom he admired for not being afraid to beard the Gestapo in its own den, not merely once but many times. Again, that defiance had little or nothing to do with the "church"; it was rather a matter of character. In fact, I suspect that

Peter thought preachers were a little foolish for risking so much for so little. Employing the same amount of energy in any other profession they could have been carving out a big career for themselves. Peter, being poor and ambitious, had a great respect for tangible success. In any event, Peter never bothered to participate in a communion service.

Then, suddenly, at the beginning of a new year he appeared at the chancel rail to partake of the Lord's Supper! Something was happening to his convictions and, from time to time, we had informal conversations regarding the Christian faith. He began to see that the church was a "new communion." When Hitler declared war on the United States in December 1941 and the American Church was closed, Peter came to say good-bye. I was profoundly touched because of my real affection for Peter; although some suspicious Americans thought he was merely a Nazi agent, I had never doubted him. Moreover I had the impression that, with the closing of the church, Peter felt the props being knocked out from under him. I hoped that he would soon look back upon those props as temporary and unnecessary crutches, and that he would now find himself able to walk back to his church on his own spiritual legs.

When I located Peter after the war was over, I found that much had happened. He had been near death because of a skull injury in Italy. His house in Potsdam was destroyed and he had lost track of his wife. Luckily he found her safe with the baby at her parents' home in western Germany. All their possessions were gone but they had each other and they were grateful. After much waiting, Peter found a place on a hospital staff at a very meagre salary, and with his old irrepressible vigor set about building his career again. But, with a difference. He had become interested in the relation between religion and medicine. He no longer believed that pastors were the last relics of tribal witchcraft. He had learned that casualties of war must frequently be treated in soul as well as in body.

The World Council of Churches offered Peter an opportunity to be one of the first Germans to come to Switzerland for three months to live with a group of young men and women from many countries. They were not theological students, or even active church members, but they were people who had begun to see the importance of God during their experiences in various armies, or resistance movements, or concentration camps and prisons. At first Peter thought that this Ecumenical Institute was designed solely as a sort of forum in which po-

litical and economic problems of the post-war period would be debated under Christian auspices. He thought that was a wonderful idea, because he was interested now in the Christian answers to world problems; but he was disappointed because such a large proportion of time was given to Bible study and prayer. Peter wanted the church "to show the world."

When Peter returned to Germany, he was honest enough to criticize himself more than the conference. The church apparently had something which still escaped him. He felt that he had made a fool of himself in Switzerland, or at least that he had offended many people whom he wanted to know as friends. Then, several months later, he was invited to a similar but smaller "house party" at Lee Abbey in England.

Peter's delight at being in England again was unrestrained.

> It was lovely to be in London again after the war. You cannot imagine how happy I was. This was a different world and yet familiar, for seeing everything again was like meeting good old friends after a long absence. And it might seem strange to you and you will most probably say "German sentimentality," but I was inwardly moved when I walked down the Strand, Trafalgar Square and Whitehall to the Houses of Parliament.

But Peter had not merely made a sentimental journey to the city which the Nazi Luftwaffe had tried to demolish. He told me all about the "retreat" at Lee Abbey. These are his words, after he had returned home:

> We had a very fine prayer meeting every morning which was only attended by some 20 people out of about 150. Leslie Sutton, a layman, took them. I liked them very much and did not miss a single one if I possibly could help it. The rest of the day was free for picnics, sports, and sightseeing trips; then there was a so-called "Epilogue" or vesper service at night. For me those days at Lee Abbey really were an excellent follow-up of Bossey (Switzerland). Many of the problems with which I was confronted at Bossey seemed to gain greater reality in lovely Devonshire. And it is extraordinary that I really loved those Bible classes and prayer meetings, which I did not quite understand while I was at Bossey. Every good thing takes some time to settle down, and every seed takes its time until it grows up, and more time before it bears fruit.

Yes, it has taken many years and many kinds of people to cultivate Peter's Christian faith. Peter, however, has long since become a witness himself. The latest effect of the change in him has been reflected in his family.

"One of the greatest joys I have had," he writes, "was when I left for

England and my wife, who was a Roman Catholic but left the church, told me, 'I think I am going to become a Protestant. There is something in that creed which is marvelous.' I have never tried to convert her," adds Peter, "and I am so glad this came from herself. Yet I answered her, 'I think the time has not come yet. I want you to wait awhile until you are entirely convinced.' I think this is the outcome of Bossey, because I often discussed our course there with my wife."

Peter returned to London for a few days and the extent to which he had changed since the time when I first knew him in Berlin became apparent. I could never have imagined him taking active part in an evangelistic service, yet that is exactly what he did, and his description of it sounds as though he did not consider it unusual.

I took part in a service at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, right in the heart of London. It was a combined Lutheran-Anglican or, in other words, German-English service. The sermon was preached by a German pastor on "Who is my brother?" I read the lesson in German. The three other Germans gave witness. It was a very impressive service and the big church was crowded. The next day we had a follow-up meeting in the crypt of the church, and there was another good attendance. Many questions had to be answered. It is good to see how interested English people – at least the Christian part of them – are in the German question and how willing everybody is to help. I found so much friendship and so much understanding, and this really made me happy.

And now Peter wants to go to Australia! Well, I've seen a lot of postwar Germany and I can't blame him for wanting to extricate his family from the mess and start life over again. But he was right when he hazarded the guess that I would not approve of his plan. Why? It is not because I object to the settlement of Germans in other parts of the world. He knows that. Far from being an advocate of "letting them stew in their own juice," I contend that if we do not let them either emigrate or rebuild, we shall be morally guilty of deliberate mass murder. We have stuffed about ten million more people than the entire pre-war population into two-thirds of the pre-war area. Not only has much of the best agricultural land been cut off, but the industrial West was supposed to become largely pastoral. It was obvious that people would either have to emigrate, be fed by us forever, or die off until the population could be supported inside the new boundaries. Fortunately, our government at last shows signs of understanding this problem, even though we appear to be primarily interested in building a defense against Russia.

My reason for not approving of Peter's scheme is that Germany needs people like him. So does the German church. For a couple hundred years it has been the protesting Germans who pulled up stakes and got out. The ones who remained behind were willing to submit or they had to submit. Sometimes religious freedom was at stake, sometimes it was political freedom, frequently they fled to avoid compulsory military training. Tens of thousands of Germans came to the United States in the nineteenth century to avoid a year of armed service and if they went back — even forty years later and as American citizens — were in danger of immediate arrest. Now there is some danger that the "good Germans" once more will move out when the bars are let down.

Moreover, I have a lingering feeling that it's up to Peter to see the church through. I would like him to ponder on his own spiritual history in the possibility that he might come to a similar conclusion regarding the church. He owes it something. It was on guard when he wasn't. The Christian renewal of Germany is a matter of individual responsibility, just as the resistance of the Confessing Church was. The only difference is that the chief struggle *before* May 1945 was with totalitarian Hitlerism; *now* it is with . . . us. But the task of the Christian to make the world in which he lives more Christian has not changed.

When we come to the conclusion that Peter's task begins at home, it goes without saying that we have a task which begins at home too. His responsibility does not lessen ours, which is to make America more Christian. The future evolution of Germany depends just as much on us as it does on him. This refers especially to our Christian people who — like Peter — are in a decided minority so far as the impact upon the immediate future of our world is concerned. Peter cannot carry on without Christendom.

THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AND THE YOUNGER CHURCHES

By DANIEL THAMBYRAJAH NILES

THE Bible story of God's redeeming activity is a story with two loci. On the one hand it is the story of the redemption of history, *the story of the nations* as they come to birth in God's providence, their reactions as God uses them and overrules them, and the treasures which they bring into God's final harvesting. On the other hand it is the story of redemption within history, *the story of the Church* as it comes to birth through God's sovereign call of a people unto himself, and the growth of that Church among all people gathering within it all who bear his name.

The fact of these two loci has meant that the Church itself has been subject through its history to two impulses. First there was the *universal* impulse, born of the Church's consciousness that it was God's instrument for the mediation of his redemption to all the world; and therefore it was the house, the undivided and common home, of all God's people. And second, there was *the local impulse,* born of the conviction that in every land it was called to be in that land the city upon a hill, the lump of leaven hid within the meal.

Particular in method, universal in scope — these characterize God's actions. He called a particular people to be a people peculiar to him, but he called them that through them all the nations of the earth may be blessed. The particularism of the Deuteronomist and the universalism of the prophets; the nationalism of Ezra and the world concern of the writer of Jonah; the localism of the Judaizers and the missionary outlook of Paul — these are but instances of the working out of this double impulse.

The way in which these forces acted and reacted on each other since the time the Church became based in the West also reveals a perceptible pattern. The universal emphasis was predominant during the early centuries of the Western era when Europe came to its unity under the discipline of the Holy Roman Empire. Then came the period of nationhood in Europe, and with it the emergence of national Churches. It is God who brings the nations to birth, and it is God who also prepares for them and in them the Church which is his body.

With the great imperial expansion of the West, there was a further coming together of God's world, a pulling together politically of all the races. And during this period, the Church under God saw and fulfilled its vocation in and through the great missionary movement. It was the working out again of the universal impulse. It was the period of expansion of the great international Christian denominations which served to link together the Churches in all lands into a working partnership, and helped the people of the world, so widely different, to grow into larger likeness to each other.

Now in our day new nations are coming to birth in the lands of the East. God's time has arrived for them, and again God is busy with his people calling them in every land to their distinctive tasks. The Church Unity Movement in these countries must be understood as the result of the Churches there seeking each other at the moment of their common call. And yet it is because "Church Unity" has become the concern of the nations that it is necessary to provide the reservoir from which the local and the universal impulses, the ecumenical and the national forces, may flow; no more in conflict or even in separation but in harmony. One phase of history is over. The world is now one world of many nations in travail to bring their unity unto peace. And God's time has come for the Church to gird itself for its new task whereby the Churches of the nations will be the Church of God.

As the younger Churches think of the World Council of Churches, therefore, they think of it as this new reservoir from which will flow the Christian stream

> fertilizing the Church in every land,
> linking the Churches of all lands,
> and witnessing to the Church throughout the world.

Some of the problems inherent in these tasks, from the point of view of the younger Churches, will bear more detailed mention.

I

The Church in every land. "That there be a Church in every land" — that was the program of the missionary enterprise. The call now is that in every land the Church be the Church. This means first of all the search for Church unity. Co-operation between the Churches, such as the National Christian Councils stand for and promote, is essential and urgent. But co-operation is no substitute for that unity which

Christ wills for his Church. It is in their search for this that the younger Churches need the help of such a body as the World Council of Churches. For if this unity is to be a sanctification in the truth, then that truth must be apprehended with all the saints. In so far as in the World Council of Churches there is to take place a conversation between the Churches on the issues of Christian truth, to that extent the Faith and Order work of the World Council is a fundamental necessity for the younger Churches.

A caveat must be entered, however, against the Churches of the West forcing the patterns of their thought on the Churches of the East. The controversies of the Western Church have their meaning in a historical context that is theirs; and to ask the younger Churches, daughters though they are, to define where they stand with respect to those controversies is to ask them to speak from a context that is not theirs. That which belongs to history must be returned to history, and the younger Churches must follow where God's Spirit leads them.

Hence the World Council of Churches must help to safeguard for the younger Churches the fact of the *Una Sancta* — that the Church is one across the world, and therefore national Churches must remain obedient to the ecumenical truths; but it must also help to safeguard the younger Churches against that international confessionalism which would seek to impose on the younger Churches hindrances to their finding their unity in the lands to which they belong, to which Christ calls them. In the lands of the younger Churches new nations have come to birth or are coming to birth, and God's call has come to his Church in these lands to be the Church in them and for them. This call must be obeyed. God will accept his people with the preparedness with which he finds them, and he who calls is also faithful to perform; so that, in the last analysis, no one else but they who are called must answer.

The presence of the younger Churches as members of the World Council of Churches ought therefore to help to import into the Faith and Order conversations a note of urgency and timeliness; and to dissipate an attitude, where it exists, of purely theoretical discussion. But by far the larger contribution of the younger Churches to the World Council will be certainly to maintain within it a witness to the evangelistic task of the Church.

The dictum "Let the Church be the Church" takes on a particular meaning in the light of the relation between Church and state, a rela-

tion which has been to the very fore in Christian thinking in the West; but it takes on a different meaning in the light of the relation between the Church and the world, which relation has been the subject of almost exclusive thought in the East. It may well be that the missionary Churches of the West will bring their vital contribution to the World Council by the very presence in the World Council of those Churches which they have helped to create in the East, in Africa and in Latin America. In the International Missionary Council *Evangelism* is the accepted *raison d'etre,* in the World Council it is still to become the burning flame of all its constituent Churches.

It is one thing for a Church to maintain its Catholic faith and practice within its own life; it is another thing for it so to become a missionary Church as to have that faith and practice tested by other minds and within other cultures. It must be the function of the World Council to help those of its constituent Churches which have hitherto been self-contained, to lose themselves in the missionary enterprise. The ecumenical has no meaning when it is also simply national.

Often, of course, the non-evangelistic policy of certain Churches is the direct result of the attitude of the state with respect to evangelism in the lands in which these Churches are; but it is here that the World Council has one of its major obligations; namely, to clarify on the one hand the principles which must control the Churches' answer to the state specifically on the evangelistic issue; and on the other hand to clarify also the relation between the evangelistic and non-evangelistic Churches in the same country. Here there is need for larger and more conclusive consultation between the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches.

II

The Churches of all lands. "They will bring the treasures of the nations unto Zion." It is the calling of the Church in every nation to bring its gift to its Lord, but it must bring it first to its sister Churches. It is the function of the World Council to provide for this process. Two specific points should be mentioned in this connection. First of all, there is the need for the World Council not only to direct ecumenical study on common issues, but there is also the need to canalize the experience of the Church of every land in its thought, witness and worship, so that these become available to the Churches of other lands. There seems to be a tendency, at least among some of the theologians

of the older Churches, to regard the thought and experience of the younger Churches as so much source material, without the expectancy that there is and will be produced in these younger Churches an indigenous theology that merits serious consideration.

Also, since theological thought is conditioned by historical necessity, it is important for the study program of the World Council to pay pointed attention to the encouragement of theological thinking in the lands of the younger Churches, especially in the East and in Africa; since in these lands today the prevailing mood is one of creativeness while in the West it seems to be largely one of conservation. The East and the West, and the Churches in the East and the West, are in different historical moments. The Church in the West is striving to preserve in the present and for the future the obedience that it has made to God's deed in Christ and to guard that obedience from the corrosion of the modern acids of post-Christian paganism. The Church in the East and in Africa is seeking to lead its people into ways of obedience that neither they nor their forebears have trod before.

The second need which the World Council should fulfil in its program of study and sharing is to make available for ecumenical experience the worshiping wealth of the younger Churches. There is in these Churches a growing liturgical movement which draws not only from the heritage of the Christian past and present, but also from the general heritage of worship of these lands. Just as the Eastern Orthodox liturgy finds its place in the worship program of ecumenical gatherings in spite of the language difficulty; so can also indigenous services, even of the Holy Communion, be made available from the younger Churches.

But no emphasis on the contribution of the younger Churches to the process of study and sharing can be made, without at the same time emphasizing also a related fact, that of the necessity of bringing youth into this sharing process. It is inevitable and right that in the official delegations to the World Council the largest number of representatives should be from among the older leaders of the Churches: but the difference between young and old is nowhere more important than in the younger Churches. Most of the older leaders in the younger Churches have been through the period of the patriarchal relation between the mission and the Church, while so many of the youth know of that relation only as history. The difference that this has made is an emotional difference, and the World Council will serve both itself and

the younger Churches by getting into its membership both the young and the old in the delegations from the younger Churches.

Then, inasmuch as there is the Youth Department of the World Council, the way is open for the training of the youth of the younger Churches in the ecumenical movement. This is important, since it is the youth who can be taught most easily to think outside the purely denominational pattern, and it is also youth who most need to be saved from being caught by the purely national ideal. There is specific need for the Youth Department, in co-operation with the Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A., the W.S.C.F., and the W.C.C.E., to bring together immediately in each country about one hundred youth leaders in Christian work to expose them to the ecumenical vision, instruct them in the ecumenical task, and train them in the ecumenical discipline. The surest way of pulling together the Christian youth forces in a country is to fill their leaders with a common concern and to win them to a common loyalty; organizational relationships can then be worked out with less hesitation.

III

The Church throughout the world. "The task of theology," Walter Horton once said, " is to relate the truths of God to the torments of the world." It is the function of the World Council to relate the One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church to the Churches of the nations. One way in which the World Council is doing this already is by linking up all the Churches in the task of making the body of Christ relevant to the clamant problems of today.

Beginning with the immediate tasks, there is the growing program of the World Council, during and after the war-years, aspiring to assist in the total work of reconstruction, relief and rehabilitation of a stricken world. But the contribution of the younger Churches to this work has been meagre. It may be true that the younger Churches are most of them in no position to give in any significant measure toward this costly program, but they have their two mites to offer and must be challanged to offer them.

What perhaps will be of larger importance, however, is to keep these younger Churches informed about what the Churches in the West are doing in this field; for nowhere more than here can be discerned the vitality, the relevance, and the Christianity of the Churches of the West. The younger Churches need to hear and understand this wit-

ness. But it is of the utmost importance also in telling this story of what the Churches are doing after the war to relate it to what the Churches did during the war. No message is more timely in the lands of the younger Churches than the message of the Church which was *the Church in resistance* through the years of dark distress.

Every younger Church is awaking to a new task, to be the Church of a nation in that nation and for that nation, so that no longer is a program of simple evangelism enough. The Church has to proclaim the will of God to the people of the land in all their manifold affairs. It has to work to make a non-Christian state act, as far as it is possible to make it act, as if it were a state whose subjects were Christians. So that the younger Churches need help in understanding the full implications of and the methods of performing this task. And it is here that the witness of the older Churches with respect to the whole gamut of their relationships to the state is so valuable. Thus arises for the younger Churches the importance of all the study that is being pursued in the realm of Life and Work. "The great new fact of our time," said Archbishop Temple, "is the presence of the Church in every land." This new fact must gain in depth as the Church in every land becomes also the Church of that land and for it.

But the insistent problem around which the task of the World Council will turn, as it seeks to witness to the *Una Sancta,* will be the problem of intercommunion, and with respect to no other problem are the younger Churches more concerned. Without going into any full discussion of the problem of intercommunion, it is enough for the purpose of this statement to say just one thing: that the younger Churches would expect the World Council to impress upon its constituent Churches the necessity of clarifying their attitude to intercommunion in relation to the Ecumenical Movement.

The arguments on intercommunion between the Churches during the time when they were just Churches alongside each other are now outmoded, not only by the fact of the Ecumenical Movement but also by the fact that this movement is now a movement with a central source of supply in the World Council of Churches. It was possible for the Churches to make experimental decisions on the matter of intercommunion during the period when the Ecumenical Movement, and the specifically Church Unity Movement within it, grew. Such experimental decisions were made (to take only four examples) at the International Missionary Conference at Tambaram, the World Christian

Youth Conference at Oslo, the International Missionary Council meeting at Whitby, and the Faith and Order committee meeting at Clarens. None of these meetings were specifically concerned with church union but all of them were different expressions of the Ecumenical Movement. The decisions taken by each one of them on the matter of intercommunion were different. But now the time for clarification has come.

It is true that there are those who do not believe in intercommunion at all, and who when they speak of intercommunion as the consummation of union are not talking about intercommunion but communion. And there are those who practice intercommunion for whom such practice has nothing to do with the Lord's will for the unity of his Church. But it is dangerous, nay suicidal, for ecumenical gatherings simply to oscillate between these two points of view.

We have labored all night and caught nothing. Now we hug the shore. The time has come to put out into the deep and let down our nets. It is the Lord's bidding.

THE RELIGION OF THE INCARNATION*

By LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

THE Society for the emasculation of great words has had a tumultuous if not a distinguished history. It has devitalized everything which it has touched. It has wrought untold havoc with the dictionary. It has not understood words yet has attacked their meaning. It has continued to use words and has destroyed their meaning. Its work has been insidious. It has come to men who were devoted to certain words because of their tremendous meaning. It has used these words with a deceptive and plausible friendliness. The man who loved the words because of their meaning was often taken in. Surely these men who used the words with such easy assurance would be men whom he could trust. But gradually he became aware that somehow, in a fashion he did not at all understand, his great words had come to mean something quite other than they had meant to him. He still had the words but he had quite lost the great and noble meanings. So in the Dominion of the Mind we need a national anthem which perpetually calls upon men to stand on guard in respect of the words they use and the words other men use. "Here is a delightful and precious word," they must say. "It comes trailing gracious meanings. But just what do we mean when we use it now? Are we subtly changing the emphasis so that the true meaning escapes and only a lifeless literary corpse remains? Or are we using the word sincerely and honestly with full loyalty to the morals of the mind?"

I

Of course a constant going back to clear definitions does not save us from the battles of the mind. But it does make those battles honest and authentic. And it saves us completely from fighting in the dark.

The word "humanism" may have the most various connotations. It may mean a philosophy of life which tries to make man lord of a godless universe. It may mean a philosophy which sees man as self-sufficient whatever gods there be. It may mean such an inspection of

* The first of four lectures delivered at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, October 1947, under the Chancellor's Lectureship.

man's essential nature as sees man made for God and finding the true meaning and completion of life only in him. It is the last meaning which will be fundamental and essential for the discussions which we are now to conduct.

The word "God" may have oddly various connotations. It may mean the being of conscious intelligence and masterful power who made and sustains the world and all that is in it. It may be a name for whatever force moves through man's strange existence with molding power. It may be an evasive attempt to refer to the power not ourselves that makes for righteousness. A recent influential thinker has used God as a name for the creative act. The word may stand as a covering name for those forces in the universe making for ideal ends. The word may be reduced to pure abstraction standing for the principles to which we come when we think of virtue and the virtues on the largest scale. Obviously a good many of these positions represent the complete emasculation of the word. In our discussions we shall use the term to mean the conscious being of perfect intelligence and perfect character who has made and sustains the universe.

The word "religion" may have various meanings. It may be used in a large way to represent our commerce with ultimate reality. It may be used to represent our commitment to ideal ends. It may be used to express the demands of a cult without reference to conduct. It may be used to express the demands of conduct without reference to a cult. It may be so abstract a mysticism that men think themselves emancipated when they transcend all connections with any historic meaning. It may be based firmly upon what it believes to be the emergence in history of divine meaning and divine acts, and at last of a divine person. It may represent the experiences of men with the God whose face we see in the face of Jesus Christ. The religion of the Incarnation sees the eternal and the temporal meeting in history. This last position will emerge as definitive for our discussion.

II

The more closely we study the matter, the more it will be clear that to go wrong in any of these regards is to court not only intellectual but practical disaster.

We live in an age when much thinking is brilliantly psychopathic. Such utter tragedy has come upon the world and upon human life that certain thinkers find a sadistic delight in insulting humanity. They

find the secret of these bitter days, not in man's misuse of his freedom, but in the very quality and structure of his nature. They take an unholy joy in blackening the very sources of man's life. They see man as foredoomed by his very essential quality to a course of disintegrating and chaotic evil. They see man coming from the Creator's hand with a mark more terrible than the mark of Cain upon him. They rush to the opposite extreme from that represented by a superficial optimism and retreat into a terrible cave of unholy despair where the very sources of human life are poisoned.

Curiously enough, such men receive an eager hearing in many quarters in our times. It is felt that the note of tragedy they sound corresponds to the actual realities of a world of cruel concentration camps and wholesale murder. It is not seen by the men who accept this philosophy of black despair that in the end it would make all religion and all hope for the human race impossible. For its central position is an attack upon the character of God. The obscure terrors of the most cruel paganism do not have roots more bitterly terrible than that of a religion whose first assertion is that God made man so that his very nature as God constructed it condemns him to one long history of evil thoughts, evil purposes and evil deeds. An ethical God is bound by his own nature to purposes of good. He can make men who by the misuse of freedom can fall into all sorts of evil ways. But he cannot make men predetermined to evil without repudiating his own eternal nature as goodness and truth alive in divine being. Such a view of God's creative activity actually dethrones God and puts a sinister devil on the throne of the universe. The very sovereignty of God is expressed in that loyalty to his own nature which makes it impossible for him to create evil or that which inevitably becomes evil, and makes it necessary for him to be the eternal source of good. To be sure, creatures who can freely choose good may tragically misuse their powers and/or freely choose evil. But this is a contradiction of the divine purpose and not an expression of it. God is perfectly good and it is his purpose that good should triumph everywhere and always.

III

But if the belief in a man created by God so that inevitably he must go wrong is an attack upon the character of God, that belief also saps the very roots of all moral life. You can have no sin in a world where man inevitably must go wrong. Or rather there is sin, but it is the sin

of the Creator who made man's evil course inevitable by the fashion in which he constructed his nature. Evil is the wrong in which man is inevitably entangled. Sin is the wrong which he freely and responsibly chooses. A man can be unhappy in the presence of the evil in which his life is entangled. But he cannot repent of it. You can only repent of that for which you are fully responsible. So that theology of pessimism about the very structure of human nature has at last precisely the opposite effect from that which its upholders would expect. It tends to produce men who feel that they are victims rather than that they are sinners. And inevitably a touch of curious and inverted complacency comes into the thoughts of the man who feels that he has gone wrong because he could not help it. The next step is the willingness to make the most of lawless pleasures since one is helpless in any event when confronted by their allurement. It is possible to give a very sinister interpretation to Luther's words: "Sin boldly." The antinomian is the son of the man who finds evil in the very structure of man's nature and not in the misuse of his will. Of course there is no sound basis for any ethical life at all in a universe where a man is asked to use a freedom he does not possess in order to turn from evil which he has no power to escape, and to beat his breast in bitter penitence for wrongdoing which the very structure of his nature forced upon him.

It is clear then, that if religion is to become a power in our time, it must be based upon a doctrine of God in which his sovereign grace is the expression of the perfect goodness — the ineluctable ethic — which is his essential nature, and a doctrine of man the moral elements of which are in complete agreement with those principles which make a sound and secure ethic possible. And more than this, if life itself is not to fall apart in complete frustration and confusion and chaos, just these conditions are to be met.

IV

We now desire to make the claim that it is just the religion of the Incarnation which answers to these profound necessities and that of the religion of the Incarnation alone is it possible that this claim can be made successfully.

The religion of the Incarnation first of all declares that there is that in man to which God can speak. It asserts that there is that in man through which God can speak. It asserts that there is that in man which is profoundly akin to God. It declares that man is so related to

the Creator and sustainer of his life that, while man cannot become God, God can become man.

The Scriptures are clear enough at this point. They see man made in the image of God. They see man capable of fellowship with God. They see man with all the things and creatures of the world under his feet. They see this man whom God has made to be King of Creation himself under God, made to serve him, in glad and loyal and friendly obedience. They see man made to obey God and not to defy him. They see man's profoundest relationships with the divine world above him and not with the world of things and beasts below him.

It is to man so made that the Son of God comes. It is the flesh made to be incandescent with a light God puts within it that the Son of God makes his own. It is precisely because of this kinship that the word can become flesh.

God has made man an imperial person. He can say "Yes" to the Creator and sustainer of his life. He can say "No" to the God who made him. He can repudiate the moral likeness to God which should be the goal of his every endeavor and the end of his life's quest. He can say "No" to goodness as well as to God. He can refuse to accept that high destiny for which God made him. But he is not so made that he must do this. He is free to say "Yes" to goodness every time he says "No." And if he scorns his birthright it still remains true that this birthright answers to the true quality of his nature as God made it, and the real meaning of his life as God meant it to be lived. Structurally, he still bears the impress of the divine image. God is perfect intelligence freely choosing. Man is relative intelligence freely choosing. And even when man uses this royal gift ignobly he is expressing his freedom, he is not mechanically taking an inevitable course.

Just because man is a being of structural likeness to God, God can become man. The perfect intelligence which eternally chooses freely that which is good and true can limit itself to the quality of experience which is relative intelligence making free choices. If man were not in some genuine sense like God, God could not become man. So God's summons to man is always to recover his true nature. It is a summons to live in his life as God meant him to live it. God is always seeking lost sons. He is never trying to make beasts men.

V

This charter of inherent nobility is the central characteristic of what

we may call Christian humanism. It is the philosophy of man made in the image of God. And the sense of glory it brings to human life is fairly dazzling. Man sees himself in the light of his ultimate relationships. And these are with that great friend, Almighty God. But the beneficent wonder of a God who made man for so high a destiny comes with the force of a transforming revelation. And when the Lord Christ looks out of human eyes and walks about with human feet and works with human hands and speaks with a human voice, he is revealing the very nature of God at the very moment when he is revealing the possibilities of men.

Such a view of all these things does not enable us to escape tragedy. But it so construes tragedy as to give it genuine ethical meaning.

It is sometimes suggested that the Christian humanist can have no adequate doctrine of sin. Rather it is only on the basis of positions which come to their final expression in Christian humanism that you can have a true doctrine of sin at all. If God made man for himself and man can either freely accept or freely reject this high destiny, then the full rejection is of the very nature of sin. Man has chosen evil when he might have chosen good. He has rejected God when he might have accepted him. And here, in the free and responsible choice of evil, you have the very darkest tragedy in the world. But God in Christ recalls man to his true destiny. And this call on the human side has a singular potency precisely because Christ from within human nature summons man to repudiate his betrayal of his own nature and of the destiny for which God made him. There is an awful and negative human dignity in the very act of sinning. There is a greater and more glorious dignity in accepting the divine call to reverse the tragic reversal and become through the grace of Christ precisely what God intended man to be when he created him.

So the unethical pessimisms of a psychopathic theology are seen in their true light and man's actual moral tragedy, which is the misuse of freedom, is also seen in its full and terrible meaning.

VI

But we may approach the whole matter in another way, and a way which, as it turns out, will have most far-reaching meaning. The great dialectic by means of which a man comes to a living and creative belief in God is impossible if man is by nature, apart from the misuse of freedom, so evil that there is nothing in him to which God can speak.

But when we study man's most distinctive intellectual and moral experiences and find him at every moment of strategy in his life poised between alternatives and making decisions in the light of standards which command his acceptance, then every element in his relative life represents a call for perfection. His relative will calls for a perfect will. His limited standards call for perfect standards. His incompleteness calls for the divine completeness. And so the movement from the human toward the divine becomes natural and inevitable. It is not that man can become God. It is that by the very necessities of his nature he cannot get along without God. And this is what a perceptive theologian meant by the daring paradox, "God cannot die while man lives."

But if man cannot get along without God, in the very nature of the case he cannot produce the divine revelation or the divine grace. But he can recognize God's voice when it speaks. And he can recognize the divine acts in human life which are involved in the Incarnation. So the human cry and the divine response meet. So in the profoundest possible way man's very nature prepares him for the Incarnation.

If you begin by blackening the character of God by insisting that he makes man for evil, and then blacken the character of man by declaring that it is his very nature to repudiate the divine, then in truth there can be no Gospel. The Good Story is possible because there is something in man which calls for good. When Jesus says to one of his prospective disciples, "Behold an Israelite indeed in whom is no guile," he is recognizing something in Nathaniel which is ready for and unconsciously waiting for his call. Unless there is something in man to which God can speak, he will speak in vain. Unless there is something in the flesh which can become incandescent with a divine glory, the Word cannot become flesh.

VII

The apostles of the extreme forms of the neo-orthodoxy are all the while depreciating the human mind and yet as constantly using the human mind to construct their dialectic. They are saying in effect: "Now you must use a mind which has become so essentially evil that no trust whatever is to be put in its processes, to construct and follow an argument whose compulsion lies in the fact that it convinces your intelligence." Really, you cannot have it both ways. Sin is dark and bitter enough. But even the man who has misused his freedom retains

a dependable quality of mind which can follow the great argument which calls him to God. And he can do this because there is a structural capacity in the mind as God created it which can think clearly even about the freedom which has been misused. There is something left in man which can pronounce sentence on his wrongdoing. And to this something God speaks. So in a deep sense the human mind is indeed the candle of the Lord.

The vast achievement of the human mind in clear thinking, in the control of nature, and in great thinking and writing, reveal qualities in human life which help us to understand the dignity which God gave to man and which remains even in a world torn by bad choices and by moral tragedy. The sense that there is something structurally sound in human nature is fundamental to the religion of the Incarnation. And so the study of man in all the good qualities of his mind and life prepares one to be ready for the Incarnation, to believe it and to accept it. In this sense the study of man is the first feature of the study of theology. The study of the man made for God prepares us for the study of the God who became man.

VIII

More than this, the study of the life of Jesus in all its stainless and productive beauty makes it very clear that the flesh itself is made to express the spiritual, that the human is made to express what comes to it from the divine. After centuries of sinning, human nature could be the vehicle of a perfect life. There is something fairly overwhelming about this. You must judge the essential qualities of human nature, not by the lowest depths to which man has sunk, but by the bright and shining achievement of Jesus within human life. So all unholy pessimisms about man are struck lifeless. So all high hopes are given security. You can only judge human nature aright when you consider what Jesus Christ has made of it.

Thus Christian humanism — the doctrine of man's essential relation to the God who entered humanity in Jesus Christ — is seen to combine the greatest possible realism in respect of the darkest aspects of human life with the highest and most glorious sense of man's essential dignity. Indeed it is just because the dignity is so great and high that the betrayal is so terrible and so full of ugly moral tragedy. The darkest moment in a man's life is that in which he faces the results of his deliberate betrayal of good and his deliberate choice of evil, and

finds himself forced to say: "This is what I have done with God's great and good gift of manhood. Thus I have prostituted a divine gift." And, like the glory of a sunrise in the Alps, comes that great and good moment when a man hears God in Jesus Christ recalling him to that true manhood which he has betrayed and repudiated. The hour when he returns to God is the hour when he returns to his true self.

IX

That this understanding of man's true dignity, as revealed in the Incarnation, is sorely needed in our age of cynicism and disillusionment and frustration and treachery, it ought not to be hard to see. Man has sunk very low. But he does not belong in the depths to which he has sunk. This is not his true self. This is not his true life. From within humanity, God in Christ calls to men to dare to be human in the precise sense of making humanity what God meant it to be.

The Incarnation is not only a great revelation of God. It is a great revelation of man. It reveals the true genius of human nature. It reveals the true goal of human nature. It reveals a dignity which shines with a strange light of promise even in this bitter and cruel world.

This Christian humanism, sealed and authenticated by the Incarnation, produces a rich and glowing sense of the human inheritance even in this world. Paul expresses the very genius of it when he writes to the Corinthians: "All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's" (I Corinthians 3: 21–23). It gives men a new sense of being at home in the universe as they accept God's gift of life in the very terms of the divine purpose. The very physical world becomes luminous with divine meaning: "The heavens declare the glory of God, the earth shows forth his handiwork." The Christian joy in the world thus reaches back to the Old Testament sense of the world as the expression of God and not as a corruption contrary to the will of God. There is a sense of the resumption of the harmony of men and things and God which was the original divine purpose and is the ultimate and assured goal. Even the New Jerusalem comes down out of heaven. It is the final fulfilment of the real meaning of this world's life.

The Greek theology with its emphasis on the Incarnation felt the sweep and the vast splendor of these great conceptions. British thought has been enriched by the same insights in the seminal and penetrating

writings of the Cambridge Platonists. Great preachers like Phillip Brooks have built their ministry about the assertion and the proclamation of this true gospel of Christian fulfilment. Life has been seen as sacramental through the development of their insights. Men have come to understand that it is the true genius of the material to express the very quality of the spiritual. Even wrecks of men have suggested to understanding observers that from which they have departed and that to which they may return. The affirmation of life and not its denial has become a fundamental position. For true life is of God and is saturated with divine meaning. Everything in true human experience belongs to life with a divine meaning. Only its falsification and its betrayal leads to tragedy. The false asceticism which would deny, not the misuse of life, but life itself, is seen in its true colors. The world becomes young again. And life is full of promise as we say once more to men, "All things are yours — and ye are Christ's and Christ is God's."

X

Must we not conclude that it is just the lack of this great body of convictions which has left so many men weak in the very hour which demanded strength, frustrated in the very hour which demanded the clear eye and the stout heart? Much contemporary literature has been occupied with the photography of biological urges rather than with the turning of all energy to purposes of high intelligence and moral vigor and spiritual power. It has seen men surrendering to impulses rather than disciplining them and making them the servant of deathless meaning. Or it has been busy with the mechanical aspects of life rather than with the power to master every mechanical aspect of existence, turning it to uses beyond anything which can be found in the machine itself. The great literature of the world has always seen men in the hour of their great choices. It has not seen them the victims of streams of consciousness whose dynamic power swept them from their moorings and led to inevitable tragedy. In an age where, above anything else, we needed to be confronted by human powers and the divine support of the highest values of which we can think, men have exercised their ingenuity and their genius in reflecting the qualities of the sub-human. Men have been more interested in their glands than in their power to turn every physical energy to profound intellectual and moral and spiritual meaning.

This debacle in respect of the understanding of human life and divine resources has been an even greater tragedy than all those world-wide exhibitions of brutality which have left us stunned and bitter. Indeed these very tragedies are in no small degree the inevitable result of the dehumanizing of man and the loss of the sense of that being of perfectly moralized intelligence who controls the world. However dark the picture, the man who has a firm grasp upon the true human qualities and the available divine resources will meet the hour with high courage and undaunted hope.

Men have misused their freedom. Very well, let us make the human the thing which by its very nature it is summoned to be. Men have forgotten that, so near in potentiality is God to man that, in Jesus Christ, God looked out of human eyes, used a human mind, revealed to men the spectacle of the human life divine. Then let us behold again the wonder of the Incarnation and dare to accept its meaning for our lives and for the life of the world. The doors are all open. The future summons. The Christian humanism of the Incarnation has the key to every lock we would turn, and the solution of every problem we would solve. Because the Word has become flesh and dwelt among us we may find in life a meaning which corresponds to that high event. Flesh may answer to the summons of the Word.

AGAIN—THE WITNESS OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

By SAMUEL McCREA CAVERT

IN the Summer, 1946, issue of CHRISTENDOM, Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft made an important statement on "The Witness of the World Council of Churches." The editor has asked me to comment on this article by way of stimulating further discussion. With most of Dr. 't Hooft's interpretation of the nature and function of the Council I am in such warm accord that I am not likely to stimulate a very lively debate, but in certain matters of perspective and emphasis there may be enough difference to justify my jotting down a few observations.

As a general background I suggest three basic considerations that we do well to keep in mind in any discussion of the Ecumenical Movement and of the place of the World Council in that movement.

1. Christian unity, at its deepest level, is not something which we create but something which we discover. It is something which we receive more than something which we devise. It is something *given*, — given in what God has done for us in Christ. It is something which comes to us from the head of the Church, as a result of our common relation to him. Viewed from this angle, our problem is not to bring into being something that does not yet exist, but to find the best way of expressing a unity which is already ours.

2. The Christian unity which we have is not just a vague and nebulous spirit of goodwill, nor is it merely a sharing of certain ethical ideals. We share a common faith. In spite of all the differences between Christians of different Churches, there are central convictions, which, for all of us, constitute an ultimate core of faith. Christians are at one in believing certain things about God, about Christ, about the Holy Spirit at work in the Church. The first Assembly of the World Council will be a great illustration of this fact. The delegates will come from a hundred and twenty different bodies but they will not find themselves so heterogeneous a group as to lack deep underlying unities. They will be especially aware of those unities when they think of themselves in contrast with the secular type of mind which presumes to build a hu-

man order without any recognition of the divine order or of the significance of Christ for the world.

3. Our awareness of this existing Christian unity, partial though it be, makes a tremendous difference in our approach to the problem of *Church* unity. If thoughtful Christians in the separated Churches recognize themselves as belonging to a community of Christian life and thought, our situation is wholly other than it would be if there were no such *koinonia*. Our problem becomes one of developing the kind of institutional relationships which will (a) manifest the reality of the *koinonia* that actually exists and (b) create the conditions under which the *koinonia* may become more complete, — more complete both in its quality and in the areas of Christian experience which it embraces.

Against this background I make the following comments about Dr. 't Hooft's article.

I

If we put the emphasis on the existing unity among the Christians of different Churches, we are in a *less dialectical situation* than that which Dr. 't Hooft pictures in the early part of his statement. He says, for example, that the World Council cannot claim to be even "a partial embodiment of the *Una Sancta*." That seems to me too extreme a view. Of course the World Council is not the consummation of the unity of the Church; no thoughtful person makes any such assumption. But such a meeting of hearts and minds in fellowship and activity as the processes of the World Council involve is, in my view, *the real stuff of unity*.

As a matter of fact, Dr. 't Hooft himself, in the latter part of his paper, comes to think of the Council as much more than an organization dealing with problems of Church unity. More than once he refers to it in terms which can only mean that it is the present effort of the separated ecclesiastical bodies to manifest the existing *koinonia* which is the heart of the Church. I would myself insist that when the Churches have a sufficient sense of oneness to get together in such a program of mutual helpfulness as the World Council's Department of Reconstruction and Inter-Church Aid is now carrying on, they are manifesting something of the *Una Sancta* quite as truly as if they were joining in the recital of a common creed, adopting a plan for the mutual recognition of each other's clergy, or celebrating the Holy Communion together. They are, in fact, giving a partial demonstration of the reality of St.

Paul's conception of the Church as so truly one body that if one member suffers all suffer with it.

II

Dr. 't Hooft tends to *over-magnify the significance of agreement in utterance* at the expense of other forms of expressing unity. He is acutely concerned over whether the World Council can speak for the Churches. We ought to realize that the "witness to Christ," for which he pleads, may often be borne more effectively through deeds than through words. I would hazard the guess that the World Council's service in reconstruction and relief after the war, as well as its work for prisoners of war and refugees during the war, has done far more to make the idea of an ecumenical church credible among the people of Europe than could have been done by decades of formulating verbal statements of agreement either about the faith of the churches or about their position with reference to contemporary economic and political issues. As Baron von Hugel once said: "Christ taught us to care. Caring is the great thing. Caring matters most." If the World Council in action can give a great demonstration that Christians care for one another, it will be no secondary matter. It will do more to give reality to the ideal of the *Una Sancta* than anything else the Council can do.

III

The question of *the kind of authority* which the Council may be assumed to possess is of critical importance. Dr. 't Hooft is surely on the right track when he affirms, categorically, that neither constitutionally nor practically can it claim any authority other than the intrinsic worth of whatever it says or does. But I see no reason to be troubled by this or to wish the Council might have some kind of authority which is denied to it. The more important consideration is that it should not allow its lack of authority — in the canonical or ecclesiastical sense — to frighten it away from doing what emerging situations may require. It does not need formal authority in order to provide effective leadership. The Provisional Committee had, for example, no formal authority to set up a Department of Reconstruction and Inter-Church Aid. It did what the occasion clearly demanded at a time when wartime conditions made it impossible to do more than get the judgment of certain key leaders in certain countries. The response has shown that no other "authority" was necessary. Again, there has been no formal

authority of the Churches themselves for launching the Study Program or establishing the Ecumenical Institute. But the Churches have welcomed such steps.

These illustrations suggest that for such an organ of the Churches as the World Council the debate over authority may be academic. We must remember that in this matter the World Council is really in the same situation as some of the Churches themselves. The Churches of the Congregational order — like the Baptist, the Disciples, the Quakers and the Congregationalists — recognize no ecclesiastical authority over the local group, and yet they are able to function effectively. Why cannot the World Council do likewise?

IV

The necessity for the Council's *having a voice with reference to critical problems of the world of today* must be affirmed, whatever one's view of the nature of the Council's authority. The fact that the Churches do not delegate responsibility to the Council to speak for them in any authoritative way does not mean that it must be silent. Dr. 't Hooft is apparently looking for a voice that will be *prophetic*. I suspect "prophecy" must usually come from great individual souls rather than from large groups. But there is another kind of voice that has its own value, — the *representative* voice that gathers up a wide and true consensus of Christian judgment. If, for example, a substantial measure of agreement can be found on crucial issues within such a widely representative body of Christians as those gathered at Amsterdam next summer, this will be something of moment for the entire Church.

The question is not whether the Council should speak but under what conditions and limitations it is to speak. Three conditions seem to me essential. The first, obviously, is that whatever voice is uttered should be the result of a thorough process of study. The study must not be confined to clergymen and professors; it must include lay people who have had first-hand experience in trying to make Christian principles and standards operative in the world of public affairs. That condition, one dares to hope, may be increasingly met as a result of the work of the Study Department.

The second condition is that the utterance should represent a real consensus both of the representatives of many different ecclesiastical traditions and also of lay leaders of practical experience in different

nations. This means that the utterances will not be frequent. They should certainly not be made (save in most extreme emergencies) by staff or officers, for a few officials will not represent a sufficiently wide perspective. Perhaps statements might occasionally be made by the Central Committee as well as by the Assembly, — provided the Central Committee of ninety members or so includes leaders of wide contacts and experience.

The third condition is that the voice should not claim or assume an authority which it does not really possess. The statements that are issued are to be thought of as the carefully considered judgments of a group of trusted leaders of many different Churches meeting together to decide, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, what they can say together in the name of Christ about the obligation of Christians today. Such judgments, although lacking in all formal authority, will have moral and spiritual *authoritativeness* to whatever extent they succeed in expressing what men will regard, in their own consciences, as a Word of God for these times.

The statements of the Council might well be thought of more as messages addressed *to* the Churches by thoughtful leaders than as messages *by* the Churches to the world. I do not think the distinction is very important — after the argument about authority has been put aside. In either case, their value is likely to lie more in the realm of stimulus and guidance afforded to the membership of the Churches than in a direct influence upon governments or the secular world. In so far as the Council succeeds in focussing the attention of Christians in all the Churches on the issues of most crucial moment and in giving them a helpful sense of direction in their own citizenship, the Council will be fulfilling an indispensable function.

V

Finally, I would suggest that we need not be too worried if we are not able to answer all of Dr. 't Hooft's questions at this time! He renders a great service in pointing them out, but we need not be disheartened if some of them are still unanswered, and others only partially answered, after many years. We may well wish that the Council might not have to carry such "heavy responsibilities before it has come to a clear conception of its own character." But is not this the condition in which every new movement of a creative character finds itself? Even the early Church as we see it in the New Testament came to "a clear

conception of its own character" only as it wrestled with new concrete issues; e.g. the relation of the Jewish and the Gentile Christians to each other. We do not need to make very precise definitions of the Council and its procedures at this early stage. They will be more wisely made in the light of our developing ecumenical experience than on solely *a priori* grounds. To say this is not to advocate a purely empirical approach. It is only to call attention to the fact that the World Council, as "a fellowship of Churches," is something so new in Christian history and so pregnant with possibilities that we cannot expect to describe it fully in advance. We may trust the conciliar process which has been inaugurated and believe that a "free General Council of Holy Christendom" — which the reformers of the sixteenth century desired but did not see — will be under the guidance of the Spirit of God.

CHRISTIAN UNITY IN NON-SACRAMENTAL WORSHIP: A SYMPOSIUM

IN inviting participation in the symposium, the editor indicated the following as possible lines of approach. His suggestions were not offered for necessarily direct answer; but it was hoped that they might serve as sort of pump-priming function.

It is illogical and undesirable to divide non-sacramental and sacramental worship in thought or in practice.

In ecumenical experience, however, they are actually divided. With respect to sacramental intercommunion, the way is blocked for the present to anything like universal acceptance. With respect to common worship, however, the door is wide open.

At all the great ecumenical assemblies of modern times, including those dominated by the Younger Churches and by Christian youth, it has been an almost universal testimony that the worship services constituted the high climax of the entire corporate experience. These worship services were authentic in that they represented in every possible objective sense the presence of God with his Church and communion with God in, through, and under the forms used. They were likewise exalted experiences, meeting every subjective mark of valid worship. Finally, they were unifying experiences affirming and increasing the consciousness of underlying unity on the part of participants.

These ecumenical services of worship have been characterized by great range and variety of usage and expression, and have demonstrated that freedom, as well as valid use of historical tradition, is possible within the current limitations due to our denominational differences.

We thus have the basis in experience for anticipating a further advance in realizing the unifying possibilities of common worship.

Should not these possibilities be pursued as one of the major advances in unity, and might not the ecumenical movement set up processes by which further experiences in common worship may be greatly stimulated and normalized? Should it not at least set standards for united worship in ecumenical gatherings on all levels, and open possibilities for their use by individual churches and congregations.

In an effort to stimulate discussion, eight questions were raised:

1. Has the church a basis in the common elements, both of content and of form, used in non-sacramental worship which can be developed as a further unifying influence?

2. Might the Ecumenical Movement — presumably through some organ of the

World Council – develop a manual of common worship for use in united services, and in congregations, which should serve as a "norm" in this field?

3. In what sense is a "norm" of worship conceivable or desirable?
4. What range and variety of form and content should such a normative manual express?
5. For what creative novelties should it provide?
6. What voluntary acceptance and use would it be likely to get?
7. What status might be given it by action of the several churches?
8. What unifying results might be anticipated?

These questions proved too wide-ranging for specific answer within the space permitted the participants in the symposium. They have, however, served as the occasion for the writing of the four enriching articles which follow.

H. Paul Douglass

CAN CHRISTIANS GET TOGETHER IN COMMON WORSHIP

By JAMES DALTON MORRISON

ARE we not already closer together than we realize? If a man from Mars, unschooled in our distinctive doctrinal differences, should examine the hymnals and worship manuals of the various denominations, would he not have difficulty in discovering why we do not all attend the same church? No denominational prejudices prevent us from singing Newman's "Lead Kindly Light," Luther's "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God," Charles Wesley's "Jesus Lover of My Soul," Henry Lyte's "Abide with Me," Whittier's "Dear Lord and Father of Mankind," Joseph Gilmore's "He Leadeth Me," or other great hymns by Catholics, Lutherans, Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, Quakers, Baptists and members of other denominations. Nor do our differences prevent us from saying "Amen" to prayers of St. Chrysostom, St. Francis, William Bright, James Martineau, Walter Rauschenbusch, and other saints of the church universal. The order of worship followed in most of our churches is fundamentally the same. We nonconformists change the order about from time to time, but on the whole the pattern in the churches which aim to conduct services of worship rather than "opening exercises" is that of the sixth chapter of

Isaiah. We read from the same Bible. Above all, the object of our worship is the same: the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Here, in this supreme allegiance, transcending all other loyalties, is the church's great integrating force.

I suggest, therefore, that instead of magnifying the things that separate us, we give thanks for our common heritage in worship; that, with the assistance and under the guidance of a committee representative of all denominations, we make a study of the various aids to worship which have found most general acceptance among us, in order that we may the more fully appraise and appreciate these common elements in our worship; that we encourage pastors and others possessing gifts in this direction to create new material adapted to the peculiar needs of our own day; that these aids to worship, classical and modern, be tried out anew as opportunity arises in the various churches with the intent that after they have passed the test of experience they be gathered into a volume compiled and sponsored by the co-operating denominations.

In this volume should be included not only the great prayers, but also responsive readings and orders of worship suitable for corporate use on those occasions when members of different churches join together, as they are doing with increasing frequency on Thanksgiving and during Lent. The Christian Year, with adaptations by the Committee on Worship of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, carries many suggestions that might be used to advantage. There was a day when New England Puritans would not join in the observance of Christmas. Now an increasing number of churches of all denominations are taking advantage of the Lenten Season as a time for union services. A further use of some days and seasons of the Christian Year would not only contribute toward the spirit of ecumenicity but would strengthen our Christian emphasis. Appropriate orders — some simple, some elaborate — that have wide general appeal across denominational lines might be worked out by a representative committee.

Since it does not run counter to anyone's convictions, perhaps we might secure a further degree of conformity with regard to our down-sittings and our up-risings in the service of worship. In nonconformist churches the worshiper is never sure whether he is to stand or sit for the prayers, the responsive readings, etc. As like as not, he will stand for the opening prayer, the Invocation, and sit for the closing prayer

and benediction. This may seem a trivial matter, yet our irregularity in these trivial matters suggests to the world, in a conspicuous way, a lack of unity which, though superficial, is regarded by many as suggestive of a deeper disharmony. Moreover, it is not conducive to smoothness in the conduct of the service. It is disturbing to the mood of worship to have to interrupt it for such trivial questions as "What do we do next? Shall I stand or sit?" and to be in a state of suspense until some clear indication is given by the action of the majority of the congregation. Could we not agree on some simple procedure, as for example, "Stand to praise, sit to be instructed; sit with head bowed or kneel to pray"?

The fact that some congregations, in repeating the Lord's Prayer, say "debts" and other "trespasses" may seem to some a small matter, yet our lack of harmony here frequently makes the participation of the congregation limp from this point to the conclusion of the prayer. If somehow we could all agree on one form it would be a gain, especially on those occasions when we meet in joint services. Many ministers deliberately omit the Lord's Prayer in union services because of this lack of agreement.

Is it too much to hope that someday we might have a common Protestant hymnal? Since most of our great hymns and prayers do not reflect denominational differences there should be no serious obstacles. Baptists and Disciples in the United States have in recent years joined in compiling a hymnal. "The Hymnary" used by the Baptists of Canada is substantially the same as "The Hymnary" of the United Church of Canada, a practical demonstration of "a common tradition of church praise among Canadian Protestants."

Just as I finished writing this a former fellow-student, now a missionary to China, dropped in on me. Learning what I had written, he remarked that five churches in Chengtu (seat of the West China Union University) — the Baptist, Episcopal, Methodist, Quaker and the United Church of Canada, — though worshiping in different sanctuaries, all use the same hymnal, a volume compiled by a committee representing the various groups. Similar illustrations of co-operation come from India and elsewhere. Of course, there are circumstances which would bring about such unanimity on the foreign field quicker than in America. Yet are the vested interests and vested prejudices too great to prevent our dreaming that some day it might be realized

here? A common hymnal produced in great numbers would be a further contribution to worship and to the ecumenical movement. Being available at a price within the reach of all, perhaps some of our churches which are now trying to get along with inadequate aids might find their level of worship raised. In such a hymnal should be included, as is the case with most of our denominational hymnals, responsive readings, prayers and other aids selected and agreed upon by the proper representatives.

What voluntary acceptance might such a work expect? That would depend on the quality of its contents and the manner in which the various denominations promote its use. Some denominations might take official action commending the book to their members. Universal use, however, cannot be anticipated without months and even years of preparation. Perhaps we might begin in our church schools, where there already is considerable reciprocity in the use of worship materials. Changes such as these, if they are to bring the desired fruits, must not be imposed arbitrarily; they must come as a natural growth. But growth, as we know, can be promoted through pruning and cultivation.

As to a "norm" of worship: such, I believe, is highly desirable. Our people should appreciate that a service of worship is not just a "program" of hymns, prayers, scriptures, sermon, etc.; but conforms to a definite pattern. Of course we shall be careful to avoid such a rigid conformity that would cramp the freedom in worship which is so priceless a possession of Protestantism.

As to how wide the range and variety in form should be, it is obvious that there should be sufficient variety to meet the demands of the various denominations. At the same time we should be "selective" and should use this as an opportunity to educate our people and raise the general standard of worship. As the general standard is raised and as we draw nearer to the ideal there will surely be a greater unity in our worship.

It is difficult to predict how far reaching the influence of such a movement this might be. That we co-operate in numerous enterprises as well as we do now is due in no small measure to the degree of common worship which we have so far achieved. A greater degree of unity in worship can but result in a larger measure of Christian brotherhood, for as we draw closer to God in spirit and in truth we inevitably draw closer to one another.

ECUMENICAL COMMON WORSHIP

By HUGH THOMSON KERR

TODAY, facing as we do the permanent organization of the World Council of Churches and the coming to flower of the Ecumenical Movement, for which praise has been given and prayers offered, we find that it is not possible for Protestant Christians to participate in sacramental worship. The American section of the Faith and Order Movement, after long and careful canvassing of the situation, and in unbroken fellowship, gave expression to its findings in these words, "Our studies make it evident that both inter-communion and full reciprocal open communion are at present unattainable even within the bounds of the Ecumenical Movement." The members of the Commission representing all communions in the United States and in Canada, including the Eastern Orthodox Church, deplored "the divisions which wound the body of Christ in the world and make it impossible for them to meet in communion at one table of the Lord." It is best, therefore, to face facts and not to be led into sentimental expressions of wishful hopes.

These things being so, our problem may be stated as follows: How far can we go in providing forms and orders for worship leaving aside, for the time being, any common participation in the sacraments? The question is not easily answered, for there exist in the Ecumenical Movement two very diverse convictions on this subject. Our liturgical friends are not only wedded to their Order of Worship but are under obligation to use the same. On the other hand, there is in many churches, a strong antipathy to the use of any formal liturgy and this antipathy becomes vocal whenever the effort is made to introduce any set form or order of worship. Even within the same congregation, this difference of opinion exists and is not likely to be overcome by the permanent organization of the World Council of Churches.

This cleavage between liturgy and freedom took place in Protestantism during the seventeenth century. It was an age characterized by controversy and animosity. Perhaps someday we may have the courage to go back and erect an expiatory monument and ask for a conscience void of offense. One thing we can do and that is to propagate a better understanding regarding the history of those now far-off days. We can make clear that the liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer has never been looked upon as a sacrosanct, divinely-inspired

order. The book has been revised time and again, and this process of revision will be continued. The right to do so is clearly stated in the preface. The preface of the American Edition of 1789 uses these words:

> It is a most invaluable part of that blessed liberty, wherewith Christ hath made us free, that in His worship different forms and usages may, without offense, be allowed, provided the substance of the faith be kept entire . . . and therefore, by common consent and authority, may be altered, abridged, enlarged, amended, or otherwise disposed of, as may seem most convenient for the edification of the people.

Here, certainly, obligation is wedded to freedom.

On the other hand, Protestant churches, which are now opposed to liturgy, should know their own history. The Reformed churches, many of which are apathetic or antagonistic to liturgy, should know that at the Reformation and for a hundred years, liturgical forms were in use in Geneva and in Scotland. One of the last efforts to bring the Reformed, Puritan, and Anglican adherents into unity was made at the Savoy Conference when the Presbyterian group, in their preliminary statement said, "We are satisfied in our judgments concerning the lawfulness of a liturgy or form of worship." These historical facts should be asserted. The first step towards ecumenical worship, therefore, should be effective historical education.

The simplest form of worship is liturgical. It consists of God's call and man's response. It is God who first speaks. It is he who inspires worship; consequently the theology of the Ecumenical Movement must be clear and unmistakably evangelical. A worship service that is based on sentiment and not upon doctrine will lead nowhere. A worship service that is not rooted in the traditions of the Christian Church will end in confusion. In the present enthusiasm for forms and orders of worship, there is danger that sentimental considerations may prevail. Young people and leaders of youth are too often led astray into poetic and symbolic language, which is out of harmony with the content of the New Testament Gospel.

There is every reason why the Ecumenical Movement should make progress in preparing a form and order of common worship. Already many acceptable services have been used, and these can be adapted, revised, and edited. The ante-communion service may be used as the norm. A selection of well-chosen prayers may be added. The best hymns of the Church, ancient and modern, can be selected. Such a book would be of inestimable value in ecumenical and union services.

A good start has been made. It is not likely, however, that such a book will displace the liturgies now in use and consequently another approach may also be made. The morning and evening services of the Book of Common Prayer, of the Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland, of the Book of Common Worship of the Presbyterian Church U.S.A., of the Lutheran Churches, could be printed, side by side, at the same time making provision for freedom which will be demanded. Choice prayers and litanies gathered from ancient sources, selected by one who knows the language of liturgy and is in touch with the needs of the modern church can be used. The prayers may be grouped under Adoration, Confession, Thanksgiving, Supplication, Intercession; and the Christian Year should become the guiding principle in the arrangement of the material. Certainly, a beginning may be made in agreeing among ourselves to accept a common version of the Lord's Prayer.

In such a volume, there should be a carefully prepared section devoted to praise. The great canticles and hymns of all the centuries should be selected by one who is an authority in such matters. If properly selected, they will form the necessary ecumenical basis for common worship. At the same time, guidance in the choice of Scripture can be given either by printing specially selected Scripture readings or by providing a simple lectionary.

The preparation of such a service book must be carried forward by delicate and discretionary hands. A place for freedom must be maintained. Intimate knowledge of the past, together with sympathetic appreciation of the present, should be the master light of such an undertaking. Indeed a good beginning may be made by publishing in one volume the adequate and appropriate orders of worship already used in the services of the Ecumenical Movement.

CAN WORSHIP BE ECUMENICAL

By CONRAD BERGENDOFF

HOW do forms of worship grow? This question arises at once when the suggestion is made that the World Council of Churches might provide a manual of common worship.

It might be held that there is only one form of worship in Christendom. I admit this statement may be questioned, but actually the great

liturgies now in use are variations of a single theme. The Anglican and the Lutheran are the Protestant variations and they derive from a common source, namely the Roman Mass. And the Roman Mass, in turn, is not far removed from the other universal rite, the Orthodox. Of course within these liturgies there are differences, but the resemblances and agreements are more striking. The history of these liturgies is intimately bound up with the divisions within Christendom — in the case of the Protestant forms the liturgies are results of the divisions. It naturally suggests that efforts to bring the churches closer together would lead to attempts to agree more fully on forms of worship.

Herein lie both the hope and the despair of such unity. Because the varieties of liturgy are so closely related to the divisions themselves we realize that we are dealing not with ephemeral but fundamental factors. It is not only that liturgical forms are fixed and difficult to change — as the attempts of any group to reform its rite amply testify — but in the case of the major liturgies we touch the very heart of the doctrinal life of the bodies using them when we seek to make changes. The core of the liturgy, in the broad sense, is the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Historically and practically, the liturgical worship is the commemoration of the death of the Lord Jesus Christ and the witness to his Resurrection. More than either church historians or dogmaticians have allowed, the worship of a congregation is a corporate expression of its faith and the means by which the life of the congregation has been perpetuated. It will, therefore, be neither easier nor harder to influence the worship life of the churches than it will be to bring them to closer unity in the World Council. In fact we are but getting down to a deeper level of discussion on unity when we begin to think in terms of worship. The extent to which our common worship succeeds will be an index of the success of the Ecumenical Movement.

It is much to be grateful for that in ecumenical gatherings we have been able to sing hymns together, to hear the Word together, to recite prayers together, to receive the benediction together. But let us not deceive ourselves into thinking that we have gotten very far. It is far in relationship to the little in which we agreed before. But it is not far into the Holy of Holies. We are still in the Outer Court. We have hardly gotten beyond the preparatory service of the catechumens.

For in the formation days of the liturgy it was about at this point that the learners were dismissed. The confirmed believers could go

on. They had the knowledge of the Creed. They were one in faith in the Triune God. Theirs was the joy of the Eucharist, with its prayers, its thanksgiving, its Presence of the Risen Lord. Here were the great Vere Dignum, the Sanctus, the Hosanna, the Agnus Dei. Here the disciples were one with Christ and his prayer was fulfilled.

Can we hope that the time will ever come when all Christians will again enter into this unity? The question of a common liturgy, or even of common liturgical forms, should be discussed with nothing less than this goal in mind. We will attain no unity by trying to get *away* from this goal, nor in getting *around* it. Liturgical novelties or innovations may only obscure the true goal.

An interesting observation comes to mind from Lutheran liturgical history which may point the way for us in our dilemma. In Sweden, after the Reformation, it was soon discovered that communicants would not be present every Sunday, and the minister might not hold a communion service if there were no communicants. But the service for each Sunday was a communion service. So various attempts were made in the different dioceses to construct a liturgy without communion. But the people rebelled at the omission of the ancient forms. The result was that the Church reconstructed a service which was almost altogether the communion service without the actual communion. The communion service proved to be the norm of every service.

If we are to construct forms of worship for a reunited Christendom let us not go into the realm of experimental, mimeographed types of proposals. Rather let us move in the direction of the liturgies which have come to be the embodiment of the experience of Christian worshippers of former generations. It is not a question of going back to less mature forms. Few will contend that the faith-life of our generation is richer, fuller, more sincere than that of former ages. Rather it is in greater periods of spiritual life than our own that we find the classic expressions of worship, whether we think of spoken or sung rubrics. Our inspiration can still be found in these older liturgies.

It is not impossible that we might find avenues of unity opening up in this direction more easily than in ways we are now pursuing. We have come, for instance, to a seeming impasse in the matter of the significance of the episcopate. Yet the churches which will not agree with the episcopal churches on apostolic succession and an episcopally ordained ministry will admit, I think, the spiritual wealth and beauty of the Book of Common Prayer. It might be possible to gain agree-

ments on wide sections of the liturgy when we get nowhere in discussing the order of the church. Will it be claimed that a unity in worship according to a common rite is of less importance than a unity in the method of ordaining clergy?

We need not so much invention of novel forms or experimentation in ways of worship as a clearer understanding of the common roots of all our various forms. In seeking to meet the needs even of the modern man (who isn't as different as he likes to think from men of other periods) in worship, we may find that we are much nearer to each other and to the ancient liturgies than we thought. We have raised dogmatic barriers between the churches which a common stream of worship may find a way to penetrate so as to again refresh the spiritually thirsty of all communions.

ECUMENICITY AND NON-SACRAMENTAL WORSHIP

By CYRIL C. RICHARDSON

ECUMENICAL conferences are not altogether representative of the church's life, for this is centered more in the acts of the local congregation than in the peregrinations of delegates. The spiritual temper of such gatherings is transitory though it may be deep, occasional though it may be far-reaching, and particular though it may be embracing. In consequence the acts of worship at ecumenical conferences must differ somewhat from those of the average congregation which associates regularly and necessarily adheres to its own tradition. Laymen dislike radical changes in the service, not only because the familiar has a special appeal, but because set patterns of prayer, well-known hymns and the customary way of doing things are rich in associations. Who, for instance, would wish to experiment by rewriting the Lord's Prayer, despite its frequent perfunctory recitation?

What happens, then, at ecumenical gatherings cannot be taken as a norm for revising our orders of worship. Liturgy grows out of the experience and treasured heritage of definite Christian communities. It can scarcely arise from committees representing different churches. To be vital it must belong to a living tradition and be the outcome of deep and common experiences.

Yet we are all aware that there is no church in Christendom that cannot gain much by revising its orders of worship. Communions that have a set liturgy could benefit by greater freedom and by the spiritual resources of extempore prayer, no less than by correcting some of the evils (especially medieval ones) that are handed down from generation to generation. Churches, on the other hand, which pay scant attention to traditional forms, could recover the values of beauty and dignity which the great liturgies of Christendom incorporate. They could provide their congregations with a more active role in worship by the introduction of dialogue responses. The sense of the long and vital heritage of the church's life could be recaptured by the use of forms hallowed by the ages.

What can ecumenical groups do to further these aims?

First, they can apply themselves to understanding the church's liturgical past and to appreciating the manifold values that each has inherited.

Secondly, they can make available good literature interpreting the worship of the different churches and providing the texts and music of the services. The World Student Christian Federation did a notable service in this last connection by the publication of *Venite Adoremus,* a work that needs to be greatly expanded.

Thirdly, they can come to some common mind on the principles underlying Christian worship. Here our gravest divisions lie; but many misunderstandings can be overcome through frank discussion and the sharing of genuine experience.

Fourthly, they can devise patterns of public prayer which both incorporate the great values of the past and are adapted to our modern needs. Prayers, responses, litanies, musical settings and ceremonies can be suggested, and some of them will doubtless commend themselves to the various churches.

One thing that stands in the way of competent liturgical reform nowadays is ignorance both of the church's liturgical past and of the contribution of communions other than our own. But perhaps lack of sensitivity to unfamiliar ways most impedes our fellowship in prayer. It is difficult for the local congregation to transcend its own tradition; yet this can be accomplished to some degree as we worship in each other's churches, and strive to appreciate and understand things that are at first strange to us. "Union" services should not aim to blend together diverse elements, and least of all to discover a mini-

mum upon which we can all agree. We seek the fulness of Christ, not a lowest common denominator. Rather should such services attempt to present a single uniform tradition in its complete setting, including ceremonial and music as well as words. Liturgy is an art that comprehends far more than verbal forms. Architecture, painting, sculpture, music, actions are all a basic part of true liturgy.

Nearly all churches share a large element of our liturgical heritage as Christians. Most of us read the Scriptures, chant or say the psalms, recite the creed, and have in common many hymns and tunes. There is, too, a basic structure of prayer which most Western churches have inherited — a structure ultimately derived from the medieval Mass. Starting with some act of praise and affirmation, it passes to confession and absolution, moves on to instruction by the lections and the sermon, and culminates in intercessions and dedication. There is much to be said for this outline, though it is often wrongly extolled as the only right movement of the soul in worship. Many different patterns are possible, and neither early nor Eastern Christianity followed this typically Western type. Moreover, the structure of the Lord's Prayer itself should warn us that a confession of sins is not necessarily the best way with which to open a service.

Great variety in non-Eucharistic worship is possible by the skilful adaptation of the basic elements of praise, psalms, lections and sermon, which Christianity derived from the synagogue. When we add to these the Divine Offices of East and West, and the Reformation revisions of the latter (e.g. Morning and Evening Prayer), we gain a vision of how greatly our services could be enriched. We have much to learn, too, about the proper use of extempore prayer, silence and directed meditation.

The point, however, at which we most sorely need guidance — and it is the kind of guidance we may well look to ecumenical groups to provide — is in the modernizing of our worship. For many Christians the old forms have lost their vitality. They do not speak to the modern soul. This is as true of extempore prayer in "free" churches as of set liturgies in those that are more conservative. The church is often failing to interpret her rich past, to make it alive and address it to the modern man. She does not awaken his penitence, because she speaks in terms that do not arouse his deepest anxieties. She does not heal because she does not adequately voice his sickness or his cure. Her language appears irrelevant and seems to belong to a different age.

This applies to every aspect of our worship — music and ceremony as well as words.

It is by the blending of the ancient and the modern, and by re-creating both through the spiritual fervor of our prayers, that true liturgical reform is born. Worship is the most holy act of the church — the act, that is, whereby man recovers his "wholeness." Yet what goes on in a psychoanalyst's office is sometimes more dynamic than what goes on in a church. We cannot recover the vitality of worship merely by getting an ecumenical committee to suggest a good order of service. It will only be recovered as the local congregations become alive in Christ, discovering the relevance of the Gospel to its deep anxieties and its daily life. It is from this that confession, penitence and redemption are born, and healing flows. It is this experience that unlocks the secret of the ancient prayers and gives them power; and from it are born new prayers and ceremonies and music that speak in the idiom of our day.

We belong to the past as we belong to our own generation. Hence tradition is as important in worship as is modernity. The ancient, and often the archaic, arouse in us the enduring strength and mystery of the Faith in Christ. But liturgy has also to be relevant to our age. Thus form and freedom must be found together.

Non-Eucharistic worship is not, of course, the ideal. Originally the former was the liturgy of catechumens and penitents, not the central act of worship for the faithful. Insofar as we are not yet one, we cannot break together the one Loaf, and share the one Body which is the deepest mystery of the church's life. Yet as our appreciation of each other grows and our fellowship in worship matures, we come closer to that unity in Christ, which is the essence of the church. It is not primarily by arguing theology or by making weighty pronouncements that the church will become one. It is by standing together in our common worship before God, and by being filled with that Spirit of Christ which so touches life and re-creates it, that no barrier of denomination exists, but only Christ, who is All in All.

STRATEGIC DECISIONS, NOT TACTICAL DETAILS

By G. BROMLEY OXNAM

I

THE need for unity is urgent. Time runs out.

Our disunity is a denial of our Lord. It is disobedience of his command, disregard of his prayer. Disunity conceals the true nature of the Church.

We cannot win the world for Christ with the tactics of guerrilla warfare. We are not a resistance movement. We hold that Christ is to conquer, and that before his name every knee shall bow. This calls for general staff, grand strategy, an army. And this means union.

We can no longer call upon God to bless us in wasting wealth and talent in useless duplication, not to say downright competition. Such inefficiency is sinful.

We cannot preach with power when our consciences condemn the contradiction that lies in our proclamation of a Gospel that unites and our practice of a polity that divides.

We dare not continue to impoverish our people by denying them the spiritual riches possessed by other communions.

We cannot proclaim and establish our dynamic common faith effectively as disorganized units when confronted by dynamic ideologies that move as one. Theism and a spiritual philosophy must be proclaimed by a united Church within the freedom of democracy, if mankind is to be saved from atheism and materialism promoted by totalitarian tyranny.

It is only a united non-Roman Christianity that can hope to save Roman Christianity from its exclusiveness and its ecclesiastical totalitarianism, and thereby enable non-Roman Christianity and Roman Christianity to work together for the eventual unity of all Christendom and the building of Christ's Holy Church.

II

Our Negro brethren used to sing, "Everybody talkin' 'bout heaven ain't goin' there." It is also true that "Everybody talkin' 'bout church

union ain't goin' there." The achievement of union in South India is met by postponement of full communion in Canterbury. Such postponement is understandable; but it is disappointing in the light of the South India Declaration:

> None of the uniting churches desire that the United Church should be forever bound by what seems wise and right to them at the time of the inauguration of the union. By their own acceptance of the Basis of Union and of the initial form of the Constitution, they will endeavor to set the United Church upon a certain path. But the United Church must be left free to be led by the Spirit of God in framing its future course.

The plan for Episcopal and Presbyterian union in the United States was scuttled in the placid waters of Philadelphia. It is possible that "scuttled" may be regarded as too strong a term, but after years of careful and brotherly negotiations, if a plan can be no more than "received . . . as worthy of serious study," it would appear that the proposal had at least been submerged.

Responses of the proposals of the Congregational-Christian and Disciples of Christ Churches, asking the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America to call a meeting of representatives of American Churches to consider "the possibility of immediate closer unity of American denominations which already accord one another mutual recognition of ministers and sacraments" ran the gamut from acceptances to refusals, not to mention an offer to "send observers." Of course, there have been successes in Canada and the United States as well as in Great Britain and in Continental Europe, and prospects appear bright in New Zealand and Australia. But generally there is more talk about union than advance toward union. The scholarly volumes of the ecumenical conferences are in the libraries, and the delegates no doubt remember the parades of erudition, the search for formulae that might allow a devout follower of our Blessed Lord to receive Holy Communion at a table normally denied him. In a brilliantly written report to the Archbishop of Canterbury entitled "Catholicity," distinguished Anglicans of the "Catholic" school conclude:

> The Anglican knows that wherever he worships throughout the Anglican Communion he will find the Holy Scriptures read and public worship conducted in the vulgar tongue; he will find the historic Creeds recited alike in the rite of Holy Baptism and in the Offices; he will find the Sacrament of Confirmation administered by the Bishop; and he will know that the celebrant at the Eucharist

is a priest whom a Bishop, standing in the Apostolic Succession, has ordained. These things may be differently valued by churchmen, and even by theologians, but it is upon the constancy of these things in one single pattern that the unity of the Anglican Communion rests, with the frank recognition that parts of the pattern which are not held to be of the *esse* by some Anglicans are held to be of the *esse,* with conviction, by others. It is by a principle of constancy in Scriptures, Creeds, Sacraments and Apostolic Succession that the Anglican Communion, for all the diversity within it, remains one. If this principle may be called, at the lowest, the historical condition of our unity in the Anglican Communion, we believe it to be at the highest the precondition of the task of theological synthesis to which the Anglican Communion is, in the Divine Providence, called.

In *The Doctrine of the Church as Held and Taught in the Church of England,* by the devoted and scholarly Leonard Hodgson, we are informed:

Just as the Church of England neither asks nor answers the question whether baptism without faith or faith without baptism admits to the church, so it neither asks nor answers the question whether apostolic faith or apostolic ordination constitute the ministry. In both cases, it will be satisfied with nothing less than both, and treats the question "Which is the more important?" as a nonsense question. . . . The Church of England is represented by its bishops and official acts as valuing this ministerial succession as one link to the Apostolic Church and the Universal Church of the ages. As it looks to the future, it looks for a reunited Christendom in which the question of the status of ministers without episcopal ordination will no longer be asked, but the whole Universal Church will be unquestionably one with the Church of the New Testament, its various constituent local churches united to it and to one another both for the exercise of apostolic faith and by the succession of a ministry universally accepted as apostolic in origin and in character. Not by any merit of its own, but by the inscrutable providence and grace of God, the Church of England believes itself to have been privileged to maintain a ministry united to that of the apostles by unbroken continuity of ordination. Its desire is to share this privilege with all congregations of faithful men in which the pure Word of God is preached and the Sacraments are duly administered.

It will repay the thoughtful to restudy the volume, *The Nature of the Church,* a report of the American Theological Committee of the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order. Within it we find many statements concerning the nature of the Church. And the debate goes on.

III

Dr. Frederick M. Meek, in his statement of Christian experience and

belief entitled "This is the Church," delivered at the Old South Church in Boston at the service of his installation in January, 1947, said:

> Meanwhile the Protestant Churches are in the anomalous position of excoriating a disparate culture, and of demanding from statesmen and politicians that the absolute claims of national sovereignty be abrogated, while sects and denominations show little inclination to make the same kind of surrender for the sake of Christ. They demand from the secular culture what they will not practice in their own lives. Therefore the Protestant Church, in penitence and with direct action, must face the problem of manifesting objectively that unity in Christ which up to the present has been simply the theoretical claim of Christianity; a claim which Christians have resisted in practice because of motives and strategies which are all too frequently secular strategies, befoggingly christened "Christian demands." In this ecumenical movement (still half-heartedly supported and still being sabotaged by devotion to lesser loyalties) the importance of Congregational polity and of the Congregational doctrine of the Church is beyond exaggeration. It is admitted, even by some of Episcopal polity, that the simple unadorned Congregational doctrine of the Church is the basic doctrine of the Church found in the New Testament. The experience which the believer has of Christ is primary.

Must the reunion of the churches await the universal acceptance of the conditions upon which Anglican unity is alleged to rest? Is Dr. Meek nearer the truth when he states, "The experience which the believer has of Christ is primary." He continues, "Those who have shared in that experience are in truth the body of Christ, seeking to do God's will. And wherever the spirit of Christ is thus at work in a group of people, there is the Church, and not a local church, but literally the Church Universal."

Is there not a truer basis for unity in the experience of the redeeming love of Christ and greater possibility of fellowship in the possession of the changed heart? How seldom does the word "love" appear in the historic formulations of faith? It is to be expected that a statement of faith will begin with the words, "I believe," but is there not an antecedent declaration in which we may find the words, "I love"? True enough, our Lord called upon the people to believe, but he also summoned them to follow and to love. He prayed, "Thy Kingdom come on earth as it is in heaven." This is not the place to enter into debate. It is the place to ask, Is all this talk about union actually going there? Do we really want the reunion of the churches, or, deep in our hearts, are we outwardly making obeisance to the idea when inwardly we re-

solve not to move to union but to demand that others return to or come to us and take upon themselves our faith, our order? It is difficult to write frankly here. Simple statements are so often greeted with the arched eyebrow that patronizingly hints, "The brother lacks academic preparation, or is unaware of the real problem." This is not pleasant.

IV

Frankly, I am of the opinion that we must make a fundamental decision. Is unity of such worth that we are ready to overcome the obstacles that lie between us and its realization? If the answer is in the affirmative, then the approach to union must be changed.

In the Christian warfare, decisions of grand strategy must also be taken before tactics are planned. We were but recently involved in "global war." The church has been in war from the very beginning. We seek to conquer, in the name of Christ. But our forces are divided, and now, at the very moment when unity is so essential, we would discuss tactics before we make our over-all decisions.

In the biennial report of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army to the Secretary of War, in which he tells of the winning of the war in Europe and the Pacific, General Marshall wrote:

> When General Eisenhower was elected as the Supreme Allied Commander for Overlord, after the resumption of the conference at Cairo in December, he received this directive: You will enter the Continent of Europe and, in conjunction with the other allied nations, undertake operations aimed at the heart of Germany and the destruction of her armed forces.

The Allies had made the grand decision. General Eisenhower reached England in mid-January, and wrote General Marshall:

> It is obvious that strong and positive action is needed here in several directions. The location of various headquarters, the exact pattern of command, the tactics of the assault, and the strength in units and equipment, are all questions that have not yet been definitely settled. The most important of all these questions is that of increasing the strength of the initial assault wave in Overlord.

Do we really wish union? Then let us make the grand decision in the supreme legislative bodies or judicatories of the denominations that desire union enough to make decision. Let each communion in its own way discuss the fundamental question, Is union so desirable that we are resolved to win it? If the decision is affirmative, then such bodies can appoint the best qualified representatives, qualified in terms of under-

standing the spiritual riches that particular communion can contribute to union, qualified in the history of the service of that communion, but qualified above all by a life of Christian spirit.

V

When six or eight of ten such communions have taken such action, let the representatives meet and remain together long enough to know one another, long enough for another Pentecost. Let them draft a Plan of Union. They would be working under basic instructions to achieve union. Their purpose would not be to explore the possibilities of union. They would not be sent to enter into long and interminable discussion whose fundamental object was to preserve a particular emphasis. Their object would be to discover together in the Spirit of Christ the basis upon which the churches might become the Church. They would, of course, be forced to consider all such matters as "apostolic succession," "immersion," "ritual," "episcopacy," "second blessing," "ruling elders," and much more. If the grand decision had been made, it is not at all unlikely that the lesser factors which now divide would take their subordinate role. These factors may be preserved in unity. Unity does not emerge from them.

Too many of our previous attempts have been like meetings of the Security Council where each nation threatened veto. It is hardly necessary here to state that the Church Universal is divided into many churches. Among them are the Protestant Churches, the Eastern Orthodox Churches, and the Roman Catholic Church. In nearly all of them, the Apostles' Creed with its declaration, "I believe . . . in the Holy Catholic Church" is repeated in services of worship. No one of these churches, to the exclusion of others, is *the* Holy Catholic Church. All of them are parts of the Holy Catholic Church.

The union of Christendom can never be achieved by one part of the Holy Catholic Church insisting that all other parts shall deny their Christian convictions in order to return to a part of the Church Universal. Since the Roman Catholic Church refuses at present to consider union except upon the basis of all other churches repudiating their own churches and returning to Rome, and since this exclusiveness, which refuses even to share in co-operative religious services, is both a denial of true catholicity and of the spirit of Christ, first steps toward union must be taken by the Protestant communions. The Protestant churches must continue the present brotherly and inspiring co-opera-

tion with the Eastern Orthodox churches until such time as Protestantism is united and may then consider union with Eastern Orthodoxy, which we pray may be consummated in the not too distant future. When the full union of Protestantism and Eastern Orthodoxy is accomplished and the Christians of the world belong to but two great churches, the leadership of that glad day may be Christian enough and creative enough to kneel before a common altar, beg forgiveness of the Christ for disunity, and, sharing in the bread and wine of Holy Communion, rise in his spirit to form the Holy Catholic Church to which all Christians may belong.

VI

Basically, we are one in a common loyalty to Jesus Christ as divine Lord and Saviour. In him the Word became flesh and dwelt among us. God was incarnate in Christ. Within the Church, the true seeker may find a consistent spiritual philosophy; unsurpassed moral teachings; full opportunity to express the life of the spirit in a life of service; and satisfying beauty in its services of worship, its music, its architecture. But antecedent to doctrine, morals, social service and aesthetics is the "pearl of great price," Jesus Christ Himself, our Blessed Lord. It is he in whom we have believed. It is he who shall reign forever and ever. "On this rock I will build my church."

If ten denominations in the United States whose membership approximate twenty million were to make the affirmative decision, and their representatives were to meet to discover the means to give effect to the decision, it would soon be seen that a church, that seeks to serve a world struggling toward unity, must reveal the unity to which it summons the world. Union must preserve and develop the creative insights and practices of the many in order to enrich the life of the one. Unity must be considered in terms of the spirit rather than in terms of form. Regimentation in the life of the spirit is a contradiction in terms, since freedom is requisite to the full flowering of the spirit. There will be unity in essentials, diversity in non-essentials. The identities that unite are more significant than the differences that divide. There will be oneness in faith, variety in order. Within the Church Universal there must be liberty for the Quaker to await the moving of the spirit in silence, and freedom for the Anglican to experience spiritual ecstasy in the beauty and the glory of the liturgy and the sacraments.

VII

Does it mean that all of us would be called upon to use the Prayer Book? Not at all. But certainly the beauty and the worth of the Prayer Book would soon be known. Such a conference might well arrange four or five Orders of Service for the United Church, and the local congregations might elect which service or services would be used. In the former Episcopal Churches, of course the Prayer Book would continue, and among the Quakers, no doubt, the blessings of silence and the patient awaiting of the Inner Voice would continue, but as the years come and go, each would come to share in the riches of the other, and the services of worship preserving all the traditions of the centuries might become the possession of all.

Surely there would be little difficulty in choosing the name. The new church would not be called The Methodist Church, nor the Baptist Church, nor the Presbyterian Church. Would we call it The Holy Catholic Church, or Christ's Holy Church?

Agreement is possible. Let the representatives be charged solemnly to keep their eyes upon the Christ rather than on the practices of a particular communion. He will be present, and where he abides there is the spirit of unity. We can preserve the precious forms of worship.

There can be a common ministry. It might call for a nation-wide sacred service of re-ordination or re-consecration in which the hands of the ministers of the different spiritual traditions might be laid upon the heads of all, and thereby each minister be blessed by the gifts that lie in all, each minister holding fast to the truth that Christ is the Consecrator and that the hands are hands used by him, ordaining to sacred calling. Personally, I would be proud to kneel at any altar and to have the hands of Harry Emerson Fosdick placed upon my head, symbolizing the passing of the freedom and the independence of the Baptist tradition to the new Church; similarly, I would rejoice in receiving from Henry Sloane Coffin and from Rufus Jones the treasures of their traditions. I would count it an honor to have the hands of my dear friend Bishop Henry Knox Sherrill laid upon my head, symbolizing the unbroken traditions of the centuries, and so through the other communions, as we in turn participate, thus all becoming new ministers in Christ Jesus.

The Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion might be administered according to the different rites, but with the passing of the years the practices would become similar and the blessings of each

brought together for the blessings of all. There can be full freedom in the preservation of tradition.

There can be united action at once in many fields. Our foreign or overseas missions could become one. We could have a common hymnal. Perhaps the Methodists might teach their Episcopal friends how to sing! There could be a Protestant daily paper. With what strength we could take up the modern media of radio and of television, and use them both for the glory of God. Visual education would cease to be the sorry attempt of amateurs who enter a field calling for the highest art. A united Protestantism could summon the talents of the greatest artists of the earth, and from the screen would come the message of our Lord. There could be a united system of higher education, unitedly supported, in which we would train the lay leadership of our church, the teachers for our colleges and universities, and, in United Theological Seminaries, the ministers of the Church.

The union of American Christianity would electrify the world and accelerate the trends toward union in every continent. I write as one who has experienced the fact of union. The experience of Methodists in a united church validates faith in the larger union.

VIII

Our people are weary of discussion that has seemed to be a defense of our denominational ways rather than a discovery of his divine way.

Let us unite! I believe our laity and our clergy desire union. I believe our Lord is calling upon us to unite. Our sons sleep beneath the crosses because we have not brought all men to the cross. "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." When a United Church of Christ is established he will be lifted up!

CHRISTIAN UNITY THROUGH THE DELEGATION OF CORPORATE FUNCTIONS

By J. QUINTER MILLER

THERE are numerous approaches to Christian unity. Five have been selected as the basis of study for this Conference.* The subject of this study is the principle of the delegating by the communions of corporate functions and responsibilities to a representative common agency. This is one way in which Christian unity may be extended and deepened.

This is not a new question. The communions constituent to the Federal Council of Churches confronted it squarely at the quadrennial meeting in Indianapolis in 1932, and then backed away from its implications. The spirit of unity, within Christendom as a whole and within America in particular, has grown apace across the intervening years until today churchmen are more clearly conscious of the present inadequacy of Protestant unity and are searching for an answer.

As a point of departure, consider again the issue presented to the communions at the 1932 quadrennial meeting by the report of the Committee on Function and Structure. The committee raised three questions which called for an answer. They concern executive functions, change of emphasis, and the maintenance of the representative character of the Council.

The issue concerning *Executive Functions* was stated in these words:

> Is it the desire of the constituent bodies that the Council shall remain what, with minor exceptions, it has been during the first quarter-century of its existence — a body for mutual understanding, inspiration and fellowship, confining its activities as an agent of the churches to the co-ordination of programs, the study of social and moral issues, and occasional common action in fields otherwise unoccupied? Or has the time come when the churches (or any considerable number of them) desire to lay upon the Council a larger measure of important executive responsibility? This question emerged clearly at the quadrennial meeting of the Council in 1928 and as a result of subsequent discussions the Executive Committee in 1929 asked the Committee on Function and Structure to study the matter and report upon it.

*See Personalia section, p. viii.

We record our judgment that the churches may wisely recognize the Council as an agent which may on appropriate occasions perform administrative functions requested by the constituent bodies. The Council has occasionally done so in a limited degree in the past. The question as to what concrete tasks might be delegated to the Council, the denominations, rather than the Council, obviously must decide; but whenever the denominations desire to delegate larger administrative functions to a central body, the Council should be empowered to accept this responsibility.

Action upon this recommendation was deferred because of the opposition of a sizable minority. Favorable action thereon would have opened the way for continued and controlled experimentation in areas in which executive functions could have been exercised through the Federal Council.

The issue concerning *Change in Emphasis* was stated as a question: "In what ways can the existing powers of the Council as a stimulating, advisory and educative body (even without any enlargement of its executive power) be most effectively used?"

The action taken authorized the Council greatly to magnify its functions in the fields of evangelism, worship, Christian nurture, Christian social action on such problems as war and peace, social and racial injustice and the development of local councils, but to shape its policy within the framework of a "stimulating, advisory and educational body" without any enlargement of its executive power.

The issue concerning the *Maintenance of the Representative Character* of the Council resulted in certain changes in structure designed to strengthen its position in this respect. The wisdom of this action has been proven through the experience of the intervening years, and has been an important influence in bringing the Federal Council more fully into the consciousness of the constituent communions as a co-operative agency meriting their confidence and backing.

The past fifteen years have witnessed the drawing together of the co-operative communion and board agencies at all geographical levels. This period has been one of "merger" of parallel city and county councils until the merger process on the less than national level is now substantially complete. It has also been a period during which the more inclusive type of church council has trebled in numbers, with a total today of 670 units.

By 1950 the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the

United States of America may be consummated. When achieved, it will provide its constituent communions with an inclusive co-operative agency, so shaped as to be able to extend and deepen as desired those phases of co-operative Christian activity represented by the experience of the merging bodies.

We should therefore confront again the deferred issue of "the delegation" by the constituent communions of certain "executive powers" to the co-operative agency through which it is believed certain functions and responsibilities can be more effectively discharged.

I

A Philosophy of Co-operative Unity. An understanding of the character of the co-operative agency to which certain "executive powers" can be entrusted is imperative. In the past, the co-operative Christian enterprise has largely been of the "Council" type in which members consult with each other, with a view to arriving at mutual agreements and a plan of action. This experience has produced certain results. On the one hand it has shown the limitations of the Council type which, when confronted by the "plan of action" arrived at through consultation, lacks the executive authorization required for the most effective action. On the other hand, this experience has resulted in the partial commitment of executive responsibilities to representative agencies, such as preparation of curriculum outlines, provisions for ministries in government projects, phases of research, relief, the chaplaincy service, public utterances on social issues, etc. These point toward something beyond the consultative process, and require fuller executive authorization. The principle of "Federation" emerges within this process.

By definition, a Federation is a body within which members unite to form a mutually representative agency entrusted and empowered by them with certain duties and powers. The uniting bodies remain self-governing but each voluntarily chooses to carry forward certain of its functions, through the representative agency, which it has helped to constitute and to which it belongs.

A weakness in current practice (at all geographical levels) is the failure by the constituent communions specifically to delegate to their representative agency many of those corporate tasks which can best be done together. At a certain time or in a given community the nature

and content of these tasks varies, not only in accordance with community needs, but also with what constitutes the prevailing convictions of the communions as to what tasks can be better done together. All those corporate functions, voluntarily entrusted to the representative agency, should be accompanied by the delegation of the necessary executive powers for their discharge. This is the next step ahead in the strengthening and deepening of Christian unity.

II

Corporate Functions. Important steps toward Christian unity have been taken in each of the functional areas which follow and the way is open for an enlarging service in most of them. The extent and quality of this service has been handicapped by the hesitant and half-hearted way in which communions have delegated these functions to their representative agency. Likewise the financial backing given has generally been wholly inadequate. When the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America is established, the member communions should explicitly commit to this new representative agency the administration of certain corporate functions as rapidly as they equip the National Council to accept them. The following areas are of primary importance.

1. *Research.* Beginnings have been made in the more important research areas, although mostly in an all too fragmentary fashion. The extension and deepening of these research services, the thorough co-ordination of them and the correlation of research findings with program activities in a consistent plan awaits a more explicit assignment made by the participating communions. The fuller delegation of research responsibility accompanied by a greater sense of mutuality and sharing, both in the *research process* and the utilization of the *research findings,* would be rewarding.

2. *Radio.* A quarter century of experience in religious radio, and the enlarging opportunities which FM and television present for the future, both make imperative the extension and deepening of Christian unity in the radio field. The public wants it; the churches sense the need for it; and the radio industry would welcome it. The church's religious radio ministry cannot succeed when administered on parallel denominational and in-co-ordinated interdenominational lines. In this day of crisis and opportunity the need is for the churches to speak unitedly. A divided and competing Christianity cannot bring

a united world. The churches of America, which are inclined to cooperate, are conscious of this fact. They should be ready to assign their essential religious radio ministry to their representative agency and call now upon it to unify and strengthen this service as follows:

a. To encourage the more adequate use of religious radio as a means of accomplishing the churches' respective purposes in evangelism, teaching and service,

b. To plan together an inclusive Protestant religious radio strategy wherein the several efforts of the churches will reinforce and strengthen each other,

c. To provide a united statesmanlike approach to the Federal Communications Commission and the radio industry,

d. To furnish competent staff service as the radio program may require.

3. *Public Relations.* Moral and spiritual values make up the central core of our Christian heritage in America. The public presentation of these values should obviously be a function performed in behalf of Protestantism. The communions must act together so that Jesus Christ and his way of life may more fully permeate the public consciousness of our time. Present practice is tagged with the fraction of Protestantism which produces it (Lutheran, Methodist, Federal Council, etc.) whereas the claims of Jesus Christ and his Gospel are what really matter.

As the pattern for Protestant public relations emerges, it will become increasingly important to consider strategy, to study our problems and our programs so that we can know what we want to emphasize at a given time and can map specific public relations goals for specific periods of time.

Ideally the four areas — screen, radio, press and promotion — ought to be organized into one over-all department of public relations. Short of that, it will be absolutely essential to have close collaboration not only among these departments but also between them and the chief officials of the communions and boards.

4. *World Relief.* The achievements which Church World Service represents are heartening. Millions will be eternally grateful for their lives and restored Christian institutions because of this service. But with what slow and cumbersome steps this service was developed. This belated growth, still inadequate, was impeded by early parallel action and the absence of an explicit mandate from the communions. Based upon the experience of these post-war years, the communions should now authorize their representative agency to carry for them their

fuller service in relief and reconstruction, embracing material aid and the formulation of basic principles of comity which will guide communions in their individual and corporate relief and reconstruction service in the future.

5. *Church Architecture.* The Bureau of Church Architecture reports that there are now projected new church structures which will call for an outlay of $600,000,000. The technical counseling and guidance service in this field include:

a. Continuing research in those problems which confront all denominations in the area of church building materials, accessories, architectural styles, the adjustment of buildings to the practical needs of congregations, including those needs which are related to the development and conduct of the educational programs, methods of financing new structures and of discharging obligations on old.

b. The preparation of materials, including literature, films, film strips, and traveling exhibits which will help the churches to meet their building problems in the areas of worship, religious education, fellowship, administration and practical work.

c. The education of both ministers and lay people concerning the need for better church architecture through courses in theological seminaries, conferences and convocations.

d. Field work with local churches.

e. The development among architects of an understanding of the specialized needs of churches, structurally and functionally.

United action here needs more explicit authorization by the communions.

6. *State and Local Co-operation.* The communions have given explicit direction to the Federal Council "to assist in the organization of local branches of the Federal Council to promote its aims in their communities." Substantial results have been achieved. More staff resources are being made available for this area of service which has such great significance in the further development of Christian unity. There are two further steps, which communions should take at this time:

a. Communions, in their highest plenary life, should authorize and instruct, or recommend and suggest, to their churches and intermediary agencies that they participate more fully in the organization and work of state and/or local Councils of Churches.

b. Communions should recognize two valid patterns of representation. The first is direct representation in the membership of the National Council. The second is indirect representation through state Councils in which they are constituent members. Therefore communions should instruct their national repre-

sentative agency to see that responsibly constituted state and local Councils of Churches, while preserving their own proper autonomy and freedom for experimentation, are functionally and structurally more intimately bound up with the national organization as a vital part of the fellowship of the whole co-operative Christian enterprise.

7. *Weekday Religious Education.* The program of weekday religious education is the most practicable yet advanced for making a more adequate provision for the teaching of religion within the educational program of the community. It has proven to be a feasible plan of co-operation between state and church in the education of children. It must be done co-operatively to be well done. Communions should now authorize their representative agency to give guidance and supervision to the weekday church school program.

8. *Curriculum Production and Distribution.* The process of publishing and distributing the church school curriculum imprints is costly, competitive and inadequate. We need a curriculum system for the small church, another for the city church in the resident-neighborhood, and a third suited to the large church with a highly skilled corps of leaders. Other variations would be appropriate, but all should be developed, printed and distributed co-operatively.

As audio-visual aids develop, the placing of united Protestant distribution channels within reach of the consumer churches is imperative. The production and distribution of materials should be assigned corporately to a representative agency.

9. *Church Extension and Adjustment.* Missions at home and abroad cannot be strategically advanced on competitive denominational lines. The community knows this. More and more communions recognize it. The more seriously over-churched the area is, the more obvious is this inadequacy. Constructive beginnings in survey and planning have been made. Particularly noteworthy has been the work which Home Missions Boards have done co-operatively through the Home Missions Council at power sites and other specialized areas. But efforts locally suffer from spotty communion backing and, too frequently, from open opposition. A primary requirement for strengthening and deepening Christian unity is for communions to further pool now, through their representative agency, their whole church extension program so that hereafter a spiritually united church may exercise co-operative Christian statesmanship in church extension and in such adjustment as will draw together many of its member

branches at the parish level of the community's life. Remembering the $600,000,000 for church building plans now projected, prompt action is acutely needed.

10. *Program Co-ordination.* Program co-ordination is central to the development of a better community strategy for the churches. There is far too much isolation, parallelism and conflicts of dates between the program and promotion plans of the communions at all geographical levels. The chaos which generally obtains locally is correctable at the national levels through co-operative effort. At present denominational program and promotion plans lack integration at many points. They need co-ordinated timing. In the absence of such timing, the community impact of their effort is seriously handicapped.

Without undue infringement on the autonomy of the communions, there are adjustments which can be made co-operatively in scheduling certain program elements and in the projection of program plans which, it is believed, will strengthen the ministry of the respective communions participating, by enabling them to support and reinforce one another. The United Church Canvass is an example of how such co-ordination commands greater community attention and support. Representative Church Councils afford the agency through which, at appropriate geographical levels, the participating communions may proceed to perfect their program co-ordination.

The corporate functions which have been considered are not intended to be all inclusive but rather illustrative of areas wherein some progress has been made but a new advance is urgent. Other functions in the field of evangelism, Christian education and Christian social relations could be cited, some of which already represent high achievement in co-operative action by certain of the participating communions.

But the list of corporate functions cited above calls for fuller co-operative implementation now. By the delegation of fuller executive powers, Christian unity could be multiplied in volume and deepened in quality. Church Councils at all geographical levels, are truly the communions themselves functioning together. These Councils, acting as the representative agency of the participating communions, should be empowered by them to function for them in these corporate tasks.

III

What Delegation of Corporate Functions with Executive Power Means. The assumption back of this paper is that each communion

needs to clarify its intention to function henceforth more fully through such a representative agency nationally as the proposed National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States and through similar inclusive Church Councils in states and cities. Appropriate action might be in the following terms:

> This communion desires henceforth to carry forward its work unitedly with other evangelical communions in the fields of Research, Radio, Public Relations (including Relations with Government), World-wide Relief, Counseling on Church Architecture, State and Local Cooperation, Weekday Religious Education, Curriculum Production and Distribution, Church Extension and Adjustment, United Ministry in Government Projects, Ministry to Migrant Populations and Program Co-ordination. These functions are therefore delegated to the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, said functions to be transferred as rapidly as the National Council is prepared to accept them. This communion further engages to accompany this assignment with such financial support as will provide its fair share of the cost of this co-operative work.

When this action has been taken by the appropriate agency of the communion, the long deferred delegation of certain executive powers to the representative agency will thereby be authorized and a most significant next step toward extending and deepening Christian unity will have been taken. The *federal principle* will become operative within the conciliar process for those corporate functions which communions voluntarily choose to commit to their representative body. This body could be the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, entrusted at the time of its formation with certain administrative powers, which the member communions voluntarily choose to delegate thereto and which as members they corporately control.

The day in which merely conferring together about what churches need to do together is closing. The day we now enter is one in which the communions must decide whether they shall do or fail to do what can only be done together. The corporate functions, set forth in this paper, lie in this area. To discharge them adequately, the next step which communions now confront is clear. It is this: There should be a more explicit delegation of the responsibility for corporate functions to a representative agency, accompanied by necessary administrative authorization and financial support. The Gospel itself places this mandate upon the churches. The times likewise demand such action. Let them hesitate no longer to take this step together.

THE FEDERAL UNION PLAN

By MARK A. DAWBER

WE are assuming that it is not necessary in this Conference to debate the question of the need for Christian unity and for some form of Church union. We believe that there is a growing conviction, and in many places a general acceptance of the principle, that the next step within the Christian Church is to unite. External forms of unity would seem to be the natural expression of the unity that Christians do experience because of their common Lord and their common faith.

An increasing number of Christians are interested in a larger measure of Christian unity. Many feel that organic union is desirable, some that it is undesirable. Meanwhile, an increasing number desire to co-operate and to increase the significance of co-operation. But some denominations are ready now for more than co-operation. This number includes some who are not convinced that organic union is ever attainable or desirable. Federal Union is a method of uniting some denominations in a type of union that seems to them more significant than co-operation, however hearty the co-operation may be.

By Federal Union is meant the uniting of bodies which recognize the validity of the ministry of all parties to the union, their oneness in Christ as a fellowship of worshipping believers, and which are willing to delegate many of their functions as denominations to an interdenominational agency which for the bodies so uniting will constitute a federally united church.[1] In the remainder of this paper it will be designated *the United Church.*

Editor's Note. All papers presented at the Washington Christian Unity Conference were intended to represent group discussion. The views of the consulting group were ordinarily assimilated into the writer's presentation. With the present paper it is different. It was presented as a composite and came to the editor with several supplementary pages included, and with the request that he edit the material into a consistent whole. This he has found himself unable to do. He could not see how to fit the supplemental material into the paper as organized, without doing violence to its structure. He has, therefore, had to content himself with appending the most important paragraphs of the supplementary materials as notes following the main report. In a final note he calls attention to points at which the original paper and the supplemental material appear not to agree.

I

The most general features of the United Church may be briefly formulated as follows:

Each of the federally united denominations would retain, as long as it would desire to do so, its own machinery, habits of procedure, forms of worship, and historic peculiarities. It would recognize, however, that the modes of thought and practice characteristic of other bodies so united are equally privileged, and that unity of the faith is to be achieved through diversity rather than uniformity.

Federal Union would be established at every geographical level.

As rapidly as possible many of the program functions of the uniting denominations would be co-ordinated under united agencies. This would be true of foreign missions, home missions, Christian education, work for age- and sex-groups, etc.

The United Church would endeavor to emphasize its oneness in the midst of its differences. It would, accordingly, endeavor to inform its entire membership of the various practices of the several uniting denominations with a view to increasing mutual appreciation and underlying spiritual unity. It would regard differences as something to be commended rather than disapproved, but would keep the focus of attention on matters of agreement in faith and spiritual purpose rather than on matters of disagreement. The latter would be regarded as expressions of individual or group attitudes congenial to those of a certain branch of the church or of a particular social heritage, rather than as boundaries preventing spiritual unity.

Assuming that some of the communions likely to co-operate in the proposed National Council of Churches of Christ in America would be willing to join in a Federal Union, it might well be that some functions could be performed by the National Council more effectively than by the federally United Church. The latter might, therefore, recognize the National Council as its agent for these functions. Eventually the two might be merged into one. However, the federally united communions might at once be willing, *among themselves,* to unite in certain additional functions, before the larger number of denominations would be willing to do so. At the state and local level, the wisdom of organizing federally united bodies in areas served by Councils of Churches of the more inclusive sort might differ according to conditions.[2]

The question as to whether Federal Union could accomplish more

than increased co-operation through the proposed National Council is a fair one. In practice the answer might largely depend on how many communions would be willing increasingly to regard themselves as one Church, on how many functions they would be willing to perform together, and according to whether they would prefer to have these functions performed interdenominationally, on a co-operative basis, or as the acts of a more united Church.

II

Certain points in the above formulation require particular stress and supplementation.

Federal Union, as we conceive it, involves the following elements:

1. The united Church should have a religious foundation. It should be more than an organizational device to enable the churches to deal more effectively with practical problems. It should consist of those Churches that are willing to take the following steps to show forth their unity in faith and life:

a. A common declaration of the sources and the object of Christian faith. This would not be a creed but a common witness to the source of all creeds in the revelation of God in Christ.

b. Complete mutual recognition as Churches — with acceptance of the parity of the ministry, intercommunion, interchange of members.[8]

c. The beginning of an approach to common worship with a directory of several alternative forms of worship which can be used. Here there must be full freedom, but the existence of such a directory would in the course of years overcome the differences between churches that are more the result of accident than of conviction.

2. The constituent denominations would retain their identity and exercise all functions that are not delegated to the United Church. Mergers between two or more of these denominations (such as are now under negotiation) would simplify the structure of the United Church; but they should come without pressure from the United Church and it should be recognized that a federal structure that provides for decentralization and diversity should be maintained in the United Church.

3. The United Church should have responsibility for missions and church extension. (This would represent a great advance beyond all previous federations although it is, in principle, only an extension of practice of "comity" between denominations in these areas.) This pro-

vision would enable the United Church to approach a new community, and in time old communities as well, without duplication of effort and yet with greater effectiveness than is now possible for any existing denominations.

4. A General Assembly of the United Church would be organized, constituted of official delegates to be appointed in such a way as would be satisfactory to the denominations that desire to become part of the United Church. The General Assembly would be the authoritative body to carry out functions that might be delegated to the United Churches.

5. Under the General Assembly there would be state, county and city assemblies. These would deal with regional and local interests and questions. The county and city assemblies would have responsibility for dealing with overlapping, duplication and competition among existing churches.[4]

6. The work of the Churches that is now located in the boards, e.g. Boards of Home Missions, because of the responsibility of the United Church for church extension, should be integrated gradually. This does not mean that the work of the United Church should centralize all activities in one great ecclesiastical organization. It would be desirable that many types of work continue to be directed from various centers with some degree of autonomy.

7. Federal Union would recognize the principle that the denominations involved must be willing to decrease and might ultimately be eliminated as the United Church increased.

8. Federal Union would be the channel through which the denominations would recognize the primacy of the community and the necessity of unity to achieve community as against the primacy of the denominations and institutions.

III

A major problem created by this plan of union is its relation to the existing co-operative organizations and especially to the projected National Council of the Churches of Christ and to state and local federations of churches. As already intimated, it is probable that any Federal Union of this sort would have a narrower base than the National Council of the Churches of Christ. This suggests that there might be some competition, at least for the time and thought of churchmen most interested in unity, between this projected plan of Federal Union and

the proposed extension and consolidation of the agencies of federation. This is to be regretted; but it seems to us that the Federal Union plan, if it does involve the kinds of advance that we have indicated, would be a natural next step for the denominations that are willing to take it, and that it would have great value in the long run in the simplifying of the denominational structure of American Protestantism. This in turn would aid the co-operative enterprises which will continue to be necessary for a long time.

The United Church would be a nucleus that might come to include an increasing number of denominations and we may expect that in time its membership might become so nearly identical with that of the co-operative agencies that there would be no longer any need in America for more than one approach to unity, that of Federal Union.[5]

NOTES

Extracts from Supplementary Material attached to Dr. Dawber's paper

1. The Federal Union Plan would unite the churches of America on a functional basis, avoiding any necessity of creedal, doctrinal or sacramental uniformity. It contemplates one great Church in America which could function unitedly on national political or social issues, could undertake total evangelistic, relief or missionary drives, and could be a united voice of American Protestantism.

2. National boards would be made up of representatives from the similar boards of the constituent bodies. Such present organizations as the Home Missions Council, the Foreign Missions Conference, the International Council of Religious Education, the Church College Board, etc. would function as national bodies of the new United Church. The Federal Council would be within the United Church.

State and local Councils of Churches would . . . become the functioning arms of the United Church in their areas. They would be enlarged by amalgamating into them many missionary, educational and church planning and building functions now carried separately by denominational state or city societies.

. . . Church World Service, insofar as it functions for the churches of America, would become an agency of this United Church.

3. Ordination procedures might . . . even hold to non-intercommunion or to special clerical vows or rights, and still each denomination could be a completely functioning member of the United Church.

4. It [Federal Union] would solve the denominational and interdenominational problem of church federations, associations of ministers or other such groupings. The basis of such differences would be completely eliminated. State or local Councils would become the regional offices of the United Church. They would be financed by these churches. No longer would they be a separate group, a fifth wheel. They would become the churches of the community or area working together. They would in turn have all the power and authority of the total church behind them. They would be "the church" in that community or area.

There actually would be a place for the community or non-denominational church which is becoming even more essential in relation to rural development, federal or state housing projects, industrial expansion and other similar area planning. These churches would have a place, a program, leadership and guidance. They would be a part of the total whole and entirely regular.

It is quite possible that interdenominational local churches, approved by the federally United Church, might prefer to be related to the entire federal Church, rather than to any one or more of the federally united communions. In that case, there would be a nucleus of local churches that would belong directly to the United Church. This possibility would be welcomed and encouraged. Those who believe in union, of whatever type, must be prepared to help the Church increase, even though it means the decrease of the denomination.

[5. The most serious divergences between the paper and the supplementary material seems to be the following:

a. The main text presents Federal Union as "the method of uniting some denominations." The supplemental material "contemplates one great Church in America." These two positions are not necessarily inconsistent, if the first represents an *immediate* accomplishment and the second an *ultimate* goal. It does not appear that both could happen at the same time.

b. The report states that Federal Union would be based on a declaration of common faith, mutual recognition of churches and ministries involving intercommunion and "an approach to common worship." The supplemental material (Note 1 above) would "unite the Churches of America on a functional basis, avoiding any necessity of creedal, doctrinal or sacramental uniformity." The first statement does not imply uniformity, and there is no necessary contradiction here. It appears, however, that one version of Federal Union *asserts* a measure of doctrinal and sacramental unity, while the other *desires to avoid* all questions in this field. Life and Work apparently are to be entirely separated from Faith and Order. (Editor)]

AUSTRALIAN PLANS FOR UNION

By IVAN LEE HOLT

ABOUT the turn of the century Australian Methodists and Presbyterians, both of whom had been divided among provincial churches, united their respective constituencies into nation-wide churches. Attempts at union across denominational lines among Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians have been made from time to time over a period of thirty years. A little more than thirty years ago committees were set up representative of the three churches. A long and detailed credo was drawn up to go with a very detailed statement of church polity. The proposals for corporate union were sent to the several church courts of constituent churches with the result that Congregationalists and Methodists approved by a large majority over eighty percent. The Presbyterians, however, failed to get a majority and serious opposition on the part of a large section of that church developed. The ground of opposition was largely that the Presbyterian Church was wealthy and had large property interests. That still remains true.

Several attempts have been made to revive interest in corporate union but all have failed. The most recent of these attempts was a plan to establish a Federal Union of the Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches, midway in structure between a Federal Council and a completely unified ecclesiastical organization. This meant that each Church would preserve its own identity but that there should be co-operation in several directions, such as ministerial training, youth work, missionary enterprise, and social reform. This plan is still technically under consideration, but my information is that there is little chance of its adoption — the feeling of many being that it defeats rather than aids ultimate corporate union. [For a history and further details of this proposal see CHRISTENDOM, Autumn, 1946.]

The reaction of Australasian Methodists to all this is that the Methodist Church is prepared to negotiate with any churches to achieve the end of a really united church. The Methodist Church naturally feels that the Presbyterian Church which had defeated an earlier plan should take the initiative. In the meantime discussions have gone on between Congregationalists and Methodists. There has been the ut-

most cordiality. The only difficulties are that the Congregationalists cannot give assurances that all their churches would come in, since all are independent and some well endowed churches might prefer to remain independent. The Methodists, who constitute ten percent of the population as against the Congregationalists one percent, have wondered whether it would be worthwhile to change the name, the polity and the traditional attitudes of their church for so small a union. If one were to sum up the situation with reference to these conversations, he would possibly say that there is practical unanimity but no enthusiasm.

The Methodist Church feels that it is closer to the Anglican Church in beliefs and polity than to either one of the other two, but the real obstacle to any union or effective co-operation in this direction is the difference in theories of orders. There have been many happy fellowships and there is a vast amount of good will between the two Churches.

In reviewing the discussions between Anglicans and Methodists we have to go back to April, 1937, and the National Missionary Conference composed of representatives of nearly all the non-Roman communions. There came to this Conference a vision of a united church in the Pacific. It was felt that whatever reasons might be advanced for denominational separateness at the home bases, none could consistently be given for such a lack of unity among the infant Churches of the South Seas.

The Missionary Conference set up a committee to investigate the question of a united church in the Pacific. A few days after the close of the Conference the Bishop of Newcastle stated that the question of intercommunion on the missionary field had been laid increasingly on his conscience and expressed the hope that some attempt to find a basis for intercommunion would be made. At his suggestion, representatives of the Anglican, Methodist and Congregational Churches met for informal conferences. This intercommunion Group did not profess to represent officially the churches concerned. It was enlarged from time to time. The Presbyterians were invited and joined in the discussion. The Group does not restrict its meetings to these denominations but has stated that it will welcome members of any other communion into its fellowship. It has naturally been found impossible to limit the discussion to intercommunion on the mission field. The home-base churches also have to think of it and plan for it.

Whether or not the Group has had revealed to it any basis of intercommunion that will be accepted over a wide area, the fact is indisputable that its members have experienced remarkable fellowships. They have come to know each other in a sacred intimacy and with an ever increasing mutual confidence.

From the outset there was the utmost frankness; yet the members of the Group feel that no unkind word has ever been said. Each person has been loyal to his own convictions while he has tried to be considerate of the convictions of others. Many times it has seemed that an impasse had been reached, but these were followed by quiet waiting and confident hope for guidance and direction. Finally, a draft proposal was worked out.

Before setting forth the draft proposal, I think it is necessary to say that there was possibly much greater difference of interpretation in the matter of doctrine between individual members of each communion than between the communions themselves. There was no great problem involved in the working out of a plan for church government. The great obstacle was found to be the differing conceptions of the authority and function of the Christian ministry. The non-episcopal Group urged that all that was necessary was the common recognition of the ministry of their respective churches. With this recognition only a formal commission to preach and administer the Sacraments in each church would be required. The Anglican representatives urged that, in view of the essential importance attached by very large numbers of Anglicans to episcopal ordination, such a proposal could not form a basis for intercommunion with the Church of England as a whole. These two divergent views were examined with great care over a long period. In the end it was seen that those interested were faced with the question whether to wait until one or the other of these views was acceptable to the majority in each of the communions concerned or whether to explore some other path. The latter course was determined on. The discussions of the Group have not been related to the problems of church union *per se* but rather with the hope that barriers to intercommunion might be removed.

The results achieved could be expressed in the following proposals: (a) The churches concerned recognize the Nicene Creed as a general statement of Christian belief and agree to minister the Sacrament of Holy Communion with the elements ordained by Christ and with the use of his words of Institution; (b) there shall be a general inter-

change of ministerial commissions; (c) each church shall give its commission in and by the form used at the ordination of its own ministers; (d) it is understood that the acceptance of a wider ministerial commission would not in any sense imply reordination, but represents, in the view of those who have taken part in these conferences, the only practical method of securing such an extension of ministerial authority as will accomplish the desired end.

In the discussion the present Bishop of London, then the Archbishop of Brisbane, took a leading part. The authoritative bodies of the Anglican, Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches have now appointed official representatives to the Group.

Since the third of the draft proposals seemed a bit ambiguous there was worked out a "Declaration and Mutual Formula." In setting this forth I have included both the Rubric and the Notes.

PREFACE

(1) Seeing that the witness of the Church is lamentably weakened by divisions and misunderstanding among Christians, and that responsibility for such human frailty must be shared by all Christian communions, we are led to believe that divergent conceptions of the Ministry have, at least in part, been caused by undue or inadequate emphasis on some functions of the Ministry.

(2) Accordingly, we believe that all who have been called to exercise their ministry, within the limitations of a divided Church, should be enabled to share to the utmost a wider, fuller, and more effectual ministry in a reunited Fellowship.

(3) We are led to the conviction that it is God's Will that this wider and more effectual ministry should be initiated by the mutual laying on of hands with prayer, and with the use of such a formula as shall leave no room for any scruple or doubtfulness.

(4) To effect this purpose, we individually make the following declaration, as a general expression of our convictions, and as a basis of action through which God's will may be accomplished. (See Note a)

THE DECLARATION

(a) I, believing myself to have been called and ordained to a real ministry of the Word and Sacraments in the Church of God, am yet conscious of a desire for a wider, fuller, and more effectual ministry in a re-united fellowship.

(b) I, also believing that it is His Will that all those whom He has thus called should excercise their ministry in One Communion and Fellowship for the building up of His Kingdom, am humbly prepared to receive the mutual laying on of hands with prayer, so that all to whom I may lawfully minister within this re-united Fellowship may know without scruple or doubtfulness, that I have

been fully ordained and commissioned to preach The Word and to minister The Sacraments.

(c) I, therefore, being persuaded that all power and grace come from Christ, through His Holy Spirit, and that He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers, do freely and willingly assent to give and to receive, and to bestow and to share, so far as lies within my power, such further authority, as shall seem "good to the Holy Ghost and to us" who in this matter only seek God's glory in the Unity of His Church.

THE MUTUAL FORMULA

(To be embodied in an appropriate form of service to be mutually agreed upon.)

PRAYER

Almighty God, Who hast bestowed upon Thy servants diverse gifts of the Holy Spirit and hast called them to minister on Thy behalf to the souls of men, empower by Thy Holy Spirit this laying on of hands with prayer that it may be used of Thee to the enrichment of our ministries in the service of Thy Holy Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

THE FORMULA

Receive the Holy Ghost for the fuller exercise of Christ's ministry and priesthood in the Church of God; and for a wider and more effectual service therein take thou authority to preach the Word of God, to fulfil the ministry of reconciliation, and to minister Christ's Sacraments in the congregations whereunto thou shalt be further called or regularly appointed. And see that thou stir up the grace bestowed upon thee in the Call of God and by the laying on of hands. (See Notes [b] and [c])

RUBRIC

(1) In any area where it is desired to put these proposals into effect the Formula of Prayer for the laying on of hands is to be said by a group consisting of at least two duly chosen and appointed ministers of each Christian Communion committed in this way to intercommunion and fellowship.

(2) All such duly chosen and appointed ministers shall individually receive the mutual laying on of hands with Prayer on the occasion of their first participating in this mutual rite, but no minister shall receive such laying on of hands more than once from any one Communion.

(3) This having been fulfilled the same formula shall be used by such duly chosen and appointed ministers when laying their hands with Prayer on the head of each minister presenting himself for participating in this mutual rite.

NOTES

(a) It is understood that the procedure in the Declaration and Formula is governed by the Rubric which follows them.

(b) It is understood that this mutual laying on of hands with prayer does not supersede the normal rite of ordination in each participating communion: nor does it commit anyone so participating to a particular theory of the Ministry.

(c) "Further called" shall mean lawful invitation to officiate temporarily in any other participating Communion.

"Regularly appointed" shall mean appointment in accordance with the tests and regulations which are customary prior to ordination by the participating Communions concerned.

(d) It is understood that the acceptance of a wider ministerial commission does not in any sense imply re-ordination, but represents, in the view of those who have taken part in those conferences, the only practical method of securing such an extension of ministerial authority as will accomplish the desired end.

As is true in other sections of the world, the Group in Australasia is waiting on the Lambeth Conference. If the next Lambeth Conference endorses the proposals the Group will go ahead. The Archbishop of Canterbury has been most interested in them. It seems to me that this discussion could lead more surely to a united church in Australasia than the proposal for Federal Union between Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians.

There is discouragement, but also hope. The World Council has revived interest, and the Australian Section of the World Council is becoming constantly more influential in deepening fellowship. A letter just received from Australia voices this conviction: "It is through the Faith and Order Commission that the principal impetus to reunion will be gained."

NEW ANGLICAN REUNION PROPOSALS

By THEODORE O. WEDEL

I

AT the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, held at Philadelphia in September, 1946, there was presented for preliminary acceptance a "Basis of Union" between the Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. This document did not receive approval. The course of the debate centered around two principal issues. The first was theological, and involved the problem of recognition of a non-episcopal ministry. This issue, as is well known, divides Anglican conscience in any ecumenical negotiation. The second issue had a sociological background. The "Basis of Union" had proposed a constitutional merging of the two communions. One of the two churches, however, lives its life as a liturgical church, its membership bound together by rubrical uniformity. The other accepts a tradition of free worship. How to unite the two in one church? The "Basis of Union" had wrestled with the problem and had proposed permissive continuance of the liturgical tradition in a more comprehensive framework of freedom. But this solution disguised the difficulty. Permissive uniformity is no longer uniformity. Common Prayer without corporate rubrical sanctions is no longer "common" prayer, as Anglican tradition understands the term. Many Episcopalians, accordingly, who might have had no ultimate theological fears of a union, nevertheless felt that a union which involved such surrender of distinctive church life was going too far too fast. Anglicans have lived too long under the protective cover of their liturgical uniformity to trust themselves easily to the open sea of liturgical free enterprise.

Yet a constitutional union of necessity involves obliteration of autonomous traditions. The area of liturgical adjustment would be only one of these. Merging of organizational autonomies and of confessional traditions would eventually present similar problems. Hence, many Convention delegates who were sensitive to the undertones of the Philadelphia debate became convinced that the goal of the unity negotiations should itself receive re-examination. This had been defined as "organic union" and envisaged complete merging of the respective

church families. Might it not be possible, however, to explore forms of union short of such complete cancellation of distinct autonomies? Might not the federal idea of union, including important elements of organic union, receive imaginative attention — a union allowing continuance of relative autonomy by each of the uniting churches, but transcending mere federation? Federation we already have in such a body as the Federal Council. This lacks, however, a bond of union which, for want of a better term, could be called organic. Mere federation, for example, does not imply even intercommunion — so far, at least, as Anglicanism is concerned. Nor does it imply mutual recognition of ministries, let alone mutual ministerial interchange. Might not ecclesiological statesmanship be equal to devising a form of union midway between organic union and federation? This might well be something new in church history. But the Federal Union of the American colonies had once been something new also. Yet subsequent history had validated the experiment.

At any rate, with a confused debate as a background, and with a desire to register disapproval of the proposed plan for organic union and yet no repudiation of willingness to continue on a march toward ecumenical goals, the General Convention passed a resolution asking its Commission on Unity "to prepare a statement of faith and order, in harmony with the Lambeth Quadrilateral, upon which the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. is prepared to enter into intercommunion and to proceed toward organic federation with the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. or with any other interested Christian body."

The phrase "organic federation" is a novelty in ecumenical vocabulary. It has not received definition, though a commission of the Episcopal Church is wrestling with its meaning and possible implications. It may or may not have a future in ecumenical history. One can say of it, however, that it grew out of a concrete historical debate and expresses a dream for a form of church union which will do justice to realistic facts. While the phrase may be a novelty, the dilemma for which it is a possible hint of a solution is not new, though it has not often been frankly faced. I must, however, leave it in midair for a moment to turn to another parallel story.

II

Scarcely six weeks after the meeting of the General Convention in

Philadelphia, the Archbishop of Canterbury, recently returned to England from a visit to America, delivered a sermon before the University of Cambridge (Nov. 3, 1946) — a sermon which has had wide repercussions throughout the Anglican communion. The title of the Archbishop's sermon was "A Step Forward in Church Relations," and it dealt, though with British and not American church life as background, with the same problem which had received the attention of agitated debate in Philadelphia.

A full summary of the Archbishop's sermon is out of place here. It must be read in its entirety for an appreciation both of its generous tone and of its full practical import. For our purpose it may suffice to note that the Archbishop presents a contrast between two forms of church union. The first is that which has been most frequently tried — namely, constitutional union. He may well have had the American proposal freshly in mind. He enumerates the difficulties which full constitutional merging encounters. These difficulties center about the loss of identity within a prized tradition which constitutional uniting inevitably involves. The churches of Great Britain may, however, be ready for something more than federation. What form could the next step take? What is needed most, so the Archbishop argues, is "a process of assimilation, of growing alike. What we need is that while the folds remain distinct, there should be a movement towards a free and unfettered exchange of life in worship and sacrament between them as there is already of prayer and thought and Christian fellowship." In a word, intercommunion. The Archbishop avoids a novel formula like "organic federation," but what he has in mind is not wholly dissimilar. The acceptance of intercommunion involves for Anglicans the almost identical theological problem which would be faced in all subsequent steps toward eventual complete union — namely, that of the ministry. Why, therefore, might not this hurdle be crossed first? Schemes of reunion between episcopal and non-episcopal churches all envisage an acceptance of the episcopate as part of the reunion project. Such incorporation of episcopacy in the future reunited church, has, however, been considered contingent upon concomitant constitutional merging. But might not non-episcopal communions be persuaded to postpone the constitutional merging and begin with episcopacy by itself? "If non-episcopal churches agree that it must come into the picture, could they not take it and try it out on their own ground first?"

III

I have sketched these two fresh approaches to the reunion problem all too briefly. They may deserve detailed exploration. We may note, however, that taken together they do hew out a new line. The Archbishop's proposals, while at first glance more modest than that connoted by the phrase "organic federation," suggest a solution to the snag which organic federation would encounter also. As an Anglican sees the ecumenical scene, a solution of the problem of the ministry is a prerequisite to any reunion scheme. Once this is solved, almost anything is possible. Intercommunion, founded upon a normalized ministry, is, for an Anglican, already a form of organic federation. An American Episcopalian enjoys little more, in the way of constitutional unity, with members of other branches of the Anglican Communion than full intercommunion and mutual interchange of ministries. This opens the way, however, to merging on constitutional levels whenever two Anglican churches meet in the same territory. In a mission field like China, for example, mergings in higher synodical judicatories have already seen the light of day. If, consequently, the Archbishop's proposals should ever find acceptance, something like organic federation would be no longer a mere academic novelty. It would exist, in embryonic form at least, and could grow into more mature forms of unity.

Let us suppose, by way of concrete example, that the Methodist Church of England should take on the historic episcopate. As a result, diocesan jurisdictions might soon be given identical boundaries, and a College of Bishops receive corporate rights of oversight over the membership of both communions. Liturgical jurisdictions might remain distinct and territorially overlapping or even duplicated. But this would not necessarily destroy episcopal church order. In fact, the concept of a college of bishops constitutes no ultimate theological problem for episcopal church doctrine. More than one proposal of reunion has seen in a college of bishops, slightly novel as this device may appear, a practical way out from denominational isolation, yet not running into the difficulties of complete surrender of denominational autonomies. Organic union could then await its full bloom in its own fullness of time. It is at least quite certain that neither intercommunion nor organic federation will be a real possibility in any scheme of union shared in by Anglicans unless the ministerial problem is solved first. The Archbishop's proposals are more realistic than those

embodied in the resolution of the General Convention. They grasp the nettle where sooner or later it must be grasped.

Can these proposals, singly or in combination, make an appeal to non-Anglicans? This is, of course, the crucial question. Anglicans, if they follow the lead of the Archbishop, may launch out on a task of salesmanship. The historic episcopate has been Anglicanism's most prized ecumenical treasure. Anglican churches may be saying now to other communions: "Here it is. Take it. Use it. Reform it where your own church life finds that it needs reforming. Then share it with us in your turn in a larger church family."

Such salesmanship will, one may predict, run into sales resistance. The very offer of a shared historic episcopate may look like presumption. It seems to ask for capitulation on the issue of episcopal church order before the issue of recognition of non-episcopal ministries has been settled. The proposals simply circumvent the latter problem, which to non-episcopal churches is quite as crucial as episcopal succession is to Anglicans. This dilemma of conscience would have to be frankly faced. One may hope, however, that the Archbishop's proposals may not, on this score, be once for all opposed. Much may depend upon the context, doctrinal and liturgical, in which a concrete scheme could be presented and received. Would the incorporation of a non-episcopal ministry into the historic episcopal succession involve doctrinal commitments? Could recognition of non-episcopal ministries receive a symbolization satisfying mutual conscience? Can the rapidly proceeding recovery of the Biblical doctrine of the Church and of the hunger for historical continuity with the Church of history reach a point where an organ of continuity is itself seen as desirable by the scattered flocks of Protestantism?

From the point of view of Anglicanism, the whole ecumenical scene would be changed overnight if any such surrender of isolationism should happen. Hitherto, in tentative schemes of reunion which have involved acceptance of the historic episcopate, one may suspect that the episcopate has been, for non-Anglicans, a kind of bitter pill to be taken at the ecumenical doctor's orders, but not with enthusiasm. The reunion goal involved this submission to the historic succession, since stubborn Anglicans so demanded it, not because it was really seen as essential to the reunion goal as such. No Protestant church, so far as I know, has as yet asked for the gift of the historic episcopate because of its inherent necessity or value. The Archbishop's proposals do, how-

ever, envisage the reception by non-episcopal churches of the historic episcopate at their own request. How Anglicanism can woo other churches to voice the request presents problems of ecclesiastical etiquette which are slightly involved. The feminine role in dramas of wooing is traditionally difficult. But the Archbishop has at least honestly exposed our Anglican embarrassment. Embarrassment is not necessarily a sin. It *could* lead to charitable response.

I shall not, in this paper, pursue these embarrassments further or speculate as to the results of the Archbishop's proposals or of the possible future of a scheme for organic federation. Without committing myself to the thesis that these are the only hopeful ways toward reunion, I am frank to confess that I see great merit in them — particularly in the exploration of a reunion pattern which proceeds to full organic union by way of intermediate steps. We need to encourage ecumenical imagination. The founding fathers of the United States once projected a political novelty in their dream of a Federal Union. Why should not the churches, today in a worse state of disunion than the thirteen colonies, invite us to similar imaginative ecumenical architecture?

IV

Leaving these high matters, however, for future providential guidance, I shall venture to picture three important consequences which might result if episcopal church order were to be accepted by non-Anglican churches according to the Archbishop's suggestion. Intercommunion could follow. I have already sketched a possible emergence of colleges of bishops and the almost inevitable creation of further unifying acts. What ecumenical problems would such an event solve?

It would, in the first place, solve once and for all the basic problem of the ministry — that of mutual recognition and of creating a single ministerial succession. Non-Anglican communions may say that this is not a problem for them even now, and worries only Anglicans. I beg to question the truth of this answer. Most of the major denominations in America do recognize one another's ministries and permit ministerial interchange without reordination. But have they ever critically examined the full doctrinal import of this procedure? Ordination to the ministry, in practically all Protestant communions, still follows the ancient catholic custom of being administered by other ministers who

themselves have been similarly ordained. Call all ministers for the moment "bishops" and you have episcopal succession maintained and guarded as the historic episcopal succession has been maintained and guarded. The Westminster Confession, on this point normative for most Protestant churches, reads: "Every minister of the Word is to be ordained by imposition of hands — by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong." Congregational church order, to be sure, bases itself on another theory. The Savoy Declaration of the Congregational Churches (1658) declares that ministerial ordering "consists in the election of the Church. . . . And those who are so chosen, though not set apart by imposition of hands, are rightly constituted ministers of Jesus Christ, in whose name and authority they exercise the ministry to them so committed." But, if I am not greatly misinformed, this radical departure from universal church tradition is not general practice in Congregationalism. A ministerial succession has grown up there also. It would, indeed, be hard to locate a denomination in all of Christendom in which succession in the ministerial order is not preserved and even scrupulously guarded.

What we have, in other words, in the whole Christian world, is not, on one side, a Catholic church order preserving a ministerial succession, and, on the other, a Protestant church order with no ministerial successions. We have, instead, a congeries of successions, some old, some recent; some, like the Presbyterian, defining the necessity of succession, others, like the Congregational, maintaining succession largely in practice despite doctrinal denial of its necessity. Many of these successions recognize one another. But, in all honesty, could one not ask them to state the doctrinal criterion of recognition? Where do they, too, draw a line? Or do they draw no line? Succession must have some meaning, or else it would not have so stubbornly anchored itself even in Protestantism. What is that meaning? A succession must be maintained, or else it ceases to be a succession. Can any group of Christians start a new succession? Do the churches which now recognize one another's successions accept without reordination every minister from any denomination, even one started day before yesterday as a mushroom body by some self-appointed founder of a new sect? I may be naive. But it seems to me that reaction against some of the presumptions of Catholic church order has blinded non-episcopal communions to the fact that they have succession problems (yes, even apostolic suc-

cession problems) of their own. Ministerial recognition needs some principle to guide it.

Furthermore, a distinction clearly exists between ministerial recognition *within* a succession, and ministerial recognition *across* succession boundaries. The latter is being mutually granted among scores of Protestant communions. But it is, surely, at best by courtesy right. It is not comparable, in clear outward symbolization, with an ordination within a single succession. Every historic Reformation church ordains its ministers not merely as ministers in a denomination, but as ministers in the Church of God. Without raising the ultimate question as to whether a denomination, which is a mere fragment of the universal church, has the right to do this; one could raise the subsidiary question as to whether the universal church should not be somewhere symbolized in the ordaining act. A succession is being handed on. The generations, in the apostolic church of Christ, are being knit together. But which succession is thus being transmitted — a fragmentary denominational succession, or that of the universal church? If the latter, should not the fragmentary successions become a single succession? Recognition would then lose its ambiguous character. The ecumenical church would receive a structural symbol.

If this problem of ministerial succession should become crucial in ecumenical debate — as I wish it might — historic episcopal church order might be seen by others besides Anglicans as more than merely another doctrinally neutral church polity. Episcopacy may not be the *esse* of the Church. One could leave the Holy Spirit as Lord of the people of God. But episcopacy may be seen again as a historically necessary organ of the unity and continuity of the church — the answer to the problem of an ecumenical single succession. The church ought to be one both in space and in time. Ministerial recognition symbolizes unity across geographical or other boundaries. Succession symbolizes unity in time — fathers and sons knit together in the ongoing family of God. The episcopate has been called the "glue" of the church. This metaphor is homely and even humble. But humble service ought to be the genius of episcopal church order as of all Spirit-endowed organs of the Church of Christ.

V

Having tried my hand at a bit of salesmanship in behalf of the

episcopate, I turn to the consideration of a second problem for which the Archbishop's proposals, if accepted, could offer the beginnings of a solution.

All of us would confess, I presume, that the sin of disunion is most evident on the local level. The New Testament knows nothing of denominational churches, or if it does know something of them, it scorns the very concept. "Everyone of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided?" (I Corinthians 1: 11, 12). The New Testament knows only of a Church of Christ as the new people of God, a comprehensive ecumenical fact, and of the local city or regional ecclesia — the Church of God in Corinth, or Ephesus, or Rome. The New Testament church was not a slave to uniformity. Regional churches differed from one another in astoundingly variant forms. They might almost have been called regional denominations — the church of Syria with its high church liturgical tendencies, the church of Rome with its liturgical simplicities, the church of Constantinople with its theological glories. But these differences remained as regional distinctions. On the local level, unity had to prevail. When an African Christian on a visit to Rome is troubled in conscience about the liturgical and disciplinary discrepancies between the church of Carthage and the church of Rome, Augustine tells him: "When in Rome, do as the Romans do." The local ecclesia *is* in that locality the catholic church — a principle of church doctrine which Congregationalism is quite right in emphasizing. But this principle implies that unity must be more than that existing within an arbitrarily gathered assembly. There must be only one Church of God in Rome. There cannot be a church of Apollos, another of Cephas, and another with the presuming title "church of Christ."

Episcopal church order, with all its faults, has never surrendered this New Testament conception. Episcopal church order has, alas, committed great sins of intolerance — the maintenance of unity by secular law. But behind this aberration lingers a true view of the church. Christians within a parish, or within a city, or even within a nation, must meet in unified assemblies. Regional autonomies will, in their turn, have to be subsumed under larger ecumenical judicatories. Nationalism can inject poisons into the life of the universal church. But that is a separate problem. There may, furthermore, be a place for the gathered sect within the regional Church of God in Rome or

Chicago or London or Washington. But it is a scandal if my next door neighbor and I, both of us Christians with no heretical beliefs dividing us, cannot worship together, if the very notion of a parish has vanished from the scene, let alone the idea of the larger parish under a Great Church ministry.

Again I point to episcopal church order as a solution to this scandal of disunion on the local level. Anglicanism, for example, has never surrendered the principle that the unit of the church is first of all a parish, and secondly a city or a diocese. And I mean parish in a geographical sense, not as defining a group of parishioners coming to a place of worship from a dozen scattered suburbs. In my city of Washington, for example, every Episcopal church is still canonically confined within carefully drawn geographical boundaries. The scheme of geographical parish limits is not successful in practice, but is at least clung to in theory. One of the secrets of the success of the Roman Church is certainly that the principle of parish unity is maintained without compromise. Sects exist in Romanism in the form of religious orders. The "gathered church" is not obliterated. But it must yield priority to the church as parish and as diocese.

Let us now suppose that non-Anglican churches should adopt episcopal church order. Intercommunion and organic federation could begin. A college of bishops could unify the scattered flocks. Might not the Church of God in a local town or city re-emerge as a reality? The process would be slow. But a symbol of regional unity would have been planted. We might again see parish and diocese as embodiments of the ecumenical idea of the Church of the New Testament.

VI

The third problem for which the Archbishop's proposals offer a possible solution is peculiarly Anglican, and I may treat it briefly, asking non-Anglicans merely to lend fraternal attention. In summarizing the debate on reunion at the General Convention of Philadelphia, I alluded to the tension created when Episcopalians were asked to surrender their liturgical uniformity. Episcopate and Book of Common Prayer have been inseparable in Anglican history. Whenever episcopacy was legally enforced in the England of the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, uniformity of worship was enforced, also.

It was not until 1789 that laws maintaining uniformity were fully relaxed.

As Anglicanism faces unity negotiations, this intertwining of episcopate and liturgical uniformity creates an apparently insoluble dilemma. Episcopacy, in a constitutional merging with another communion, might be made a common possession. But not liturgical uniformity. The Book of Common Prayer would be at best permissive only. To retain it as a workable form of church life, some measure of autonomy, however, is essential. No Anglican, I presume, would today demand uniformity of worship under the Book of Common Prayer as a prerequisite to uniting with another communion. In fact, uniformity, though still rubrically binding, is being liberalized in successive editions of the Prayer Book in various branches of the Anglican communion. But as of the present, to give up the values of uniformity within a body which can enforce uniformity by rubrics, seems impossible for a majority of the members of Anglican churches. A form of organic federation, if it could be formulated, would solve Anglicanism's dilemma. Episcopacy could be divorced from liturgical uniformity and shared first. Autonomy could be retained for liturgical uniformity. Surrender of other hitherto autonomous rights, however, might proceed step by step and proceed very far. Predictions as to how far, would have to be left to future development. But the door would be open to union on levels transcending mere federation. The door once opened, God the Holy Spirit might be trusted to work his miracles of unifying grace to the wonder of the church and of the angels in heaven.

CORPORATE UNION—WHY ANYTHING LESS?

By TRUMAN B. DOUGLASS

THIS paper is written in the conviction that there is now possible in American Protestantism an expression of unity which goes beyond the extension of the co-operative and conciliar movements, which more clearly and convincingly articulates the unity of Christian people than any of the proposed plans for "federal union," and that, in those sections of Protestantism where this type of union is possible, nothing less should be contemplated as the proximate ecumenical goal. It is further held that while there are few signs to indicate the likelihood of an early union of all Christian churches in the United States, nor of all Protestant bodies even within the loosest possible scheme of federal union, there is nevertheless before us the real possibility of a uniting within the near future of communions comprising approximately forty per cent of the Protestant church members in the United States and perhaps seventy-five to eighty-five per cent of those belonging to denominations which are members of the Federal Council of Churches. While this would not give us a fully united church, few can doubt that it would be better for the Christian movement in this nation and in the world if these bodies came together than if they remained apart.

This paper recognizes that there is a unity of Christians which is supra-institutional and which is not dependent for its growth upon the success of human devices for overcoming organizational separateness. It is the *koinonia* as distinct from the *ecclesia*. There is a part of the Church — doubtless, as H. Paul Douglass insists, "the *better* part of the Church" — which "is not fully ecclesiasticized."

> It exists as a habit of cooperation based on the "we-feeling." It has a unity sustained by common symbols. It possesses a recognizable Christian *mores*. It has functional if not legal authority. It creates a variety of agencies on a voluntary basis, for example, the World Council of Churches. All these are objective social phenomena. They constitute an imperfect but still considerable degree of working unity. They are not mere incidents but rather the marks of the Church at its deepest levels.[1]

One may give hearty assent to all this, yet still insist that the forms of Christian unity are not unrelated to its substance. Institutions are not only expressive of supra-institutional realities, they also color and qualify the meanings of those realities. There is a commonalty among the people of the United States which is not merely the creature of the Federal Government; but the fact and operation of that Government have given increased coherence and richer content to these underlying unities. Conversely, the lack of adequate institutional media may seriously check and frustrate the growth and realization of community.

In a recent article,[2] Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr reminds us that the organizational unity of the churches will not by itself renew the Church. Only the Gospel can renew the Church.

> We do not gain the authority to speak to the nations by achieving the prestige of organizational unity. The authority to speak to the nations is in a Gospel which discloses a majesty and a mercy beyond all historic majesties and all human justice. When that Gospel is preached with power it will heal both the nations and the church. But it will first wound the pride and self-esteem of the churches as much as the vainglory of the nations.

All this is undeniably true. But there is another side to this truth which Dr. Niebuhr appears to have minimized. He seems not fully to take account of the extent to which the disunity of the Church has itself become an ever-present temptation to pride and self-esteem, nor of the degree to which this disunity produces an appearance of ecclesiastical vainglory of a kind which multitudes of devout Christian people do not actually cherish in their hearts. Is it not possible, also, that Dr. Niebuhr minimizes the extent to which the concern for unity is itself an expression of contrition for the pride which has produced and sustained our separations?

We have to recognize reciprocal relationship here. If denominations are in part the creations of pride of opinion and custom (though this is of course a too simple account of their origin), they must also be recognized as creators of pride. The fact of the existence of a denomination constitutes a subtle but continuous pressure upon its members to justify its existence. They justify it first of all in terms of claims to distinctiveness. But justification on grounds of alleged distinctiveness almost inevitably becomes justification of grounds of alleged superiority. Pretensions to denominational superiority, however, will nearly always appear to the community at large as being greater than are actually made — and much greater than are actually felt — by those

who are under necessity of explaining, justifying and serving the separate existence of the denomination. Thus denominationalism impedes unnecessarily the witness of the Church to its Gospel of contrition and repentance. It proclaims to the world a degree of loyalty to the traditions of men on the part of the Church which great numbers of Christians do not really entertain.

This, indeed, is one of the strongest reasons for trying to find a way of breaking with the denominational system. We do not seek the unity of the Church primarily because we think it will help Christians to become one, but rather because the disunity of the Church denies the fact and compromises the witness of that oneness which already exists among us.

I

As the ecumenical movement gathers momentum and as unions of churches, such as the Church of South India, occur, there are signs that a curious anxiety pattern is developing in the minds of some persons who are unquestionably devoted to the cause of ecumenicity. One detects a growing mood of apprehensiveness that the movement toward unity may attempt too much and go too far.

In face of the present divided state of Protestantism in America, this alarm seems somewhat inappropriate. It is a little like an unduly dainty taste in food on the part of a starving man.

The three quotations which follow may be regarded as typical of these warnings against attempting "too much" union.

The first is from Dr. Emil Brunner:

> The unity of the Church does not necessarily mean a unity of ecclesiastical organization and government. To suppose that this aspect belongs of necessity to the unity of the Church is the consequence of confusing the people of God with an ecclesiastical institution, a confusion which is typical of the Romish conception of the Church, and which has come to prevail also in Protestant "Churches." Neither the limiting of a Church by territorial boundaries, nor the variety of ecclesiastical and cultic forms, involves, in itself, a destruction of or even a peril to the Church. . . .Even the co-existence of different ecclesiastical bodies in one and the same place is not in itself an evil, if only these different ecclesiastical bodies are joined with one another by the bond of brotherly love, by mutual recognition as Churches, and by readiness to work with one another.[3]

Writing in *The Interseminary Series,* Dr. John C. Bennett issues a similar warning in which he suggests that corporate union is not only

unnecessary for the expression of authentic Christian unity but may in fact have negative and destructive consequences.

> The most complete form of church union, that which involves a single church government, is a good pattern for the union of several existing denominations, but it is an undesirable pattern for the ecumenical Church in the United States or in the world. . . . It is important to emphasize the fact that it is possible to have organic union in terms of mutual recognition, in terms of a federal structure that is tighter than any that now exists in the Church without running the risk of the development of a great monolithic Church.
>
> Church union in this final form might actually become a threat to Christian unity. When an ecclesiastical organization gives the opportunity for one group to exercise power over another group, fears, resentments and defensiveness destroy Christian unity. . . .
>
> . . . "The coming great Church" must make room within itself for the freedom to pioneer and to criticize that characterized the sects at their best. If it fails to do this, the radical ferment in the Christian gospel will break through the carefully wrought, unified structures of the Church, and a new sectarian protest will have to find its home outside the united Church.[4]

In passing, one would wish to question Dr. Bennett's assumption that denominational variety in its existing form represents a vital expression of "the freedom to pioneer and to criticize." Is not contemporary denominationalism more characteristically a disastrous diversion and draining off of the Church's creative energies? One would question also the further assumption that there are no conceivable or practicable forms of corporate union within which these basic Christian freedoms can be asserted. We may take comfort, however, from the fact that Dr. Bennett does allow corporate union as being "a good pattern for the union of several existing denominations" — which is all that is immediately contemplated in this paper.

Third among these recent statements expressing anxiety concerning corporate union is one from Dr. John A. Mackay:

> Biblical theology, and particularly the New Testament view of the Church, do not sanction, in any way, the idea of a single world organization as being the most expressive visible unity of the Christian Church. A true and effective world Christian community does not necessarily involve a single organizational form.[5]

These statements come from Christian thinkers of such eminence, whose devotion to the cause of Christian unity is so far beyond questioning, that they must be regarded with utmost seriousness. It is important, therefore, to attempt to discover the grounds of these

anxieties and to consider their validity with reference to the actual situation in American Protestantism today.

II

We return to our observation that a fear of too much and too close union seems somewhat chimerical in view of the present estate of Protestantism in this country. During the last two centuries, Protestantism has had little difficulty in initiating whatever fissiparous tendencies may have been needed to safeguard variety and freedom of Christian experience and expression. It can scarcely be contended that we are at this moment threatened by powerful centripetal forces which are likely to result in a kind of coagulation of denominations and suddenly give us a massively uniform Church. A caution against the kind of unity which expresses itself in monotonous uniformity may have been relevant in some periods of the Church's life, but there is little to suggest that it is so today.

Is it not likely that those who are apprehensive about organic union as presenting the threat of a monolithic Church have their eyes too much upon history and not enough upon the contemporary challenges to Protestantism and the promise for the future in a genuinely united Church? One suspects that they have been influenced more especially by warnings from the European churches. We believe that a good many pages of this history are irrelevant to the present situation of American Protestantism.

We would suggest, further, that the fear of too much church union does not take sufficient account of the distinctive political and social environment of church life in the United States. The argument for a federal type of church union based on the success of the federalist principle in American government is somewhat specious. Under political federalism the most significant autonomies are defined geographically. But within these geographical boundaries there are "corporate" unities existing side-by-side with freedom and variety — unities based not upon the delegation of limited authority to an inclusive and unifying governmental agency but upon the widespread acceptance of the principles and ways of cultural pluralism. The proper application of federalism to a united Church would be for the purpose of safeguarding local and regional autonomies. But in so far as plans for federal union leave the denominational system essentially undisturbed — and this seems to be characteristic of all such plans —

they tend to commit the Church to contentment with a lower order of unity than has actually been achieved in the political realm.

That something better than federalism is not only desirable but practicable is attested by the fact that some denominations already have within their own life what amounts to a corporate type of union — in the sense of having effected an authentic unity of diverse traditions and views, while at the same time maintaining side-by-side several different administrative systems, variety of worship and witness, and a generous freedom for minorities. To insist that a closer type of union than the "federal" system will result in eliminating wholesome variety and will threaten essential Christian liberties is to deny that workable solutions for the problem of freedom-within-unity have already been found in large sections of American Protestantism.

The principal inadequacy of the federal union scheme lies in its failure to alter our denominational separateness at the points where disunity is most damaging to the witness and mission of the Church. The most crippling and wasteful consequences of denominationalism are seen in our disjointed and often competitive efforts in such fields as evangelism, church extension, and Christian education. Advocates of federalism assume — it seems to us rather naively — that the denominations can be persuaded to relinquish some measure of "sovereignty" in such fields and assign these functions to an organ of united effort. It is contended that this kind of union is more readily attainable than corporate union, because it allows for perpetuation of denominational names, the conservation of prized traditional ways, and the retention of substantial autonomy by the denominational bodies. What the proponents of federal union seem to overlook is the fact that the activities which most need to be carried on unitedly are, if not in all instances constitutive functions of the Church, nevertheless constitutive functions of the denominations. To expect the denominations to relinquish functions which are essential to their existence and growth — such as evangelism, church extension, and Christian education — is really to expect them to adopt a course which will lead to their decline and ultimate extinction as separate entities. Will it actually be any easier to persuade the denominations to give up their life by this slow process of attrition than to win acceptance of a bolder plan of corporate union with its vastly more significant witness to the unity of Christians? If we are to seek union at the points where it is most needed, and where the lack of it is most hurtful to the Christian

movement, we may as well go the whole distance and attack the present denominational system at its roots.

In thus rejecting federal union as the ecumenical goal for a considerable group of American Protestant bodies, we would suggest that federalism be considered as a provisional method for relating a union of these bodies to other denominations which, because of fundamental difficulties (over such questions as orders, for example), may not be able to enter the union. Federal union would thus be recognized as a temporary expedient, and there would be among Christians a continuous and lively hope of supplanting it by the acceptance of full corporate union. In the meantime, an accomplished corporate union of major Protestant bodies would provide a demonstration of the practicability and the strength of this type of union.

III

What are the characteristics of corporate union? The following list is barely descriptive; its elaboration and refinement would be a major task of commissions preparing the basis of such a union.

1. In corporate union there will obviously be full recognition of ministries and sacraments throughout all sections of the united church. Such union requires unity in faith — though not necessarily creedal unity, and unity in worship — almost certainly not to be expressed in terms of uniformity.

2. It contemplates the disappearance of the separate names and corporate agencies of the united denominations, except as some of these may persist vestigially in local congregations and fiduciary bodies.

3. It means the establishment of such organs of corporate action, effective throughout the whole life of the Church, as shall make possible united planning and administration of all essential functions of the united fellowship. These would include evangelism, church extension, Christian education, social action, training and authorization of the ministry, etc. (It should be understood that the phrase, "throughout the whole life of the Church" does not necessarily mean national centralization of administrative responsibility. It means simply that whatever administrative principles were agreed upon would be applied without reference to the lines of demarcation which existed between the antecedent denominations.)

4. Corporate union implies united action in dealing with other Christian bodies and in furthering ecumenical relationships.

5. We have a right to assume — this on the basis of actual achievements of existing denominations — that within this corporate unity there would be sufficient freedom and flexibility to encourage experimental and prophetic movements, and that there would be adaptation of the forms of Christian life, worship and testimony to regional and local peculiarities.

IV

What are the basic agreements requisite to the perfecting of a significant corporate union by denominations including nearly fifty per cent of Protestants in the United States?

One of these is suggested by the Congregational Christian memorial to the Federal Council of Churches. In requesting the calling of a conference on church unity, that resolution attempts a delimitation of field by defining the subject of discussion as "the possibility of immediate closer unity of American denominations which already accord one another mutual recognition of ministries and sacraments." This recognition would seem to be a *sine qua non* of hopeful negotiation looking toward early union. One would not contend that the question of a valid ministry is not important for some non-Roman bodies, but one would insist that the fact that there are large sections of American Protestantism in which no serious differences on this subject exist presents the possibility — and therefore the responsibility — of moving toward corporate union without waiting upon a settlement of the question of orders.

Secondly, the possibilities of union can be greatly increased by making explicit a view of the creeds which we believe is actually held and is thus ready for open avowal by large sections of American Protestantism. This is the view that a creed is a testimony, not a test, of faith. We recognize that this conviction may be corrupted so as to give comfort to the fuzzy liberalistic prejudice against all efforts at disciplined theological thought; but we are sure this debasement is not inevitable. Indeed, we would suppose that most of our front-rank theologians hold to this view.

Among those who are in agreement that a creed is *confessio fidei,* not *lex fidei,* there would seem to be no insuperable difficulties in the way of finding an essential unity in the confessional life of the Church.

The explicit acceptance of this view would allow the Church to place due emphasis upon the responsibility for giving a vigorous and positive witness to its faith, upon its indebtedness to the classical formulations, and upon the legitimacy of variety of testimony and expression. We believe that around the avowed acceptance of this understanding of the confessions the so-called "creedal" and "non-creedal" churches might find that, without any departure from deeply held convictions, they are essentially at one.

A third condition of the type of corporate union here contemplated is agreement that *polity* is not one of the constitutive elements of the Church's life. The Church is the Community of Grace. It is constituted and sustained not by right order but by the grace of God imparted in Jesus Christ. All polities, orders, administrations belong to the "well-being" not the "being" of the Christian Society. Differences in this area are to be resolved on the basis of what will most effectively foster the peace and orderliness of the Church, give reality to its worship, and promote the vitality of its witness and service. This is not to say that the resolution of differences in this area is simple, for there are not only respect-worthy convictions on these matters but also the human preferences which derive from long custom and familiarity. But we believe that these diverse viewpoints will cease to be major impediments to union when questions of polity and order are relegated to their proper place. As Reinhold Niebuhr tersely puts it: "We think. . . that among the many idolatries against which the Christian must bear witness is the idolatry. . . which makes the right order of the Church a *sine qua non* of salvation."

Fourthly (and this will certainly seem to some of my fellow-Congregationalists a rank betrayal), I would propose that some form of episcopacy should be provided for in any plan for uniting a group of the major Protestant bodies in the United States. This is in line with the principle set forth in the declaration of the Church of South India:

> The Church of South India acknowledges that in every effort to bring together divided members of Christ's Body into one organization, the final aim must be the union in the Universal Church of all who acknowledge the name of Christ, and that the test of all local schemes of union is that they should express locally the principle of the great catholic unity of the Body of Christ.

Is it not time for those of us who belong to non-episcopal bodies to confess that episcopacy is so widely recognized and important an aspect of the life of the world-wide Church that, unless there are consider-

ations of conscience of the utmost gravity which prevent its acceptance, it should be incorporated in any plan looking to the union of several Protestant denominations? This seems to be the hope of the Archbishop of Canterbury when he suggests that non-episcopal communions try out episcopacy, as he puts it, "on their own grounds." The implication that there are "other grounds," that there are other — and possibly valid — conceptions of episcopacy beside the traditional Catholic view, is the one which must give hope to us all. For it conveys a sense of commodiousness in interpreting the meaning of episcopacy. This is reinforced by some words from the Archbishop of Brisbane:

> No one at this time of day can deny the sincerity with which the Anglican Church clings to the historic episcopate. Yet it is worth remembering that our Article XIX states that "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." A valid ministry is, of course, necessary to the due administration of the Sacraments. But it is noteworthy that in this definition of the Church it is not so much stated as left to be inferred.
>
> It is probable that we need to recover this manner of statement. Controversialists, whether Orthodox, Roman or Free Churchmen, must feel that in discussion with Anglicans they hear of little but bishops and their succession. It is time to let the world know that we realize the importance of many other elements of the Christian life. In the organism of the Divine Society episcopacy is like the spine in the human body. It is certainly necessary, but like the spine it probably functions best when not obtruded.

Such words not only give hope of finding a generous interpretation of the nature and meaning of episcopacy which will allow it to include some variety of symbolic and administrative significance, they also give wholesome advice to all who have inclined to magnify out of just proportion some characteristic of their own tradition — whether it be the historic episcopate or the so-called "autonomy" of the local congregation. These things may function best when they are not obtruded. And it is worth remembering that some of them may continue to function even if they are not specifically denominated in the constitutional order of a United Church.

This paper has been written in an attempt to take seriously the judgment of Edinburgh that corporate union "must remain for the vast majority of Christians their ideal. In a Church so united the ultimate loyalty of every member would be given to the whole body and not to

any part of it. Its members would move freely from one part to another and find every privilege of membership open to them. The sacraments would be the sacraments of the whole body. The ministry would be acceptable to all as the ministry of the whole body."

Who can doubt that a corporate union of denominations on the scale here contemplated would be of immeasurable moment for the Church and its witness? Let those bodies which can thus unite do so and with all possible speed.

REFERENCES

1. In O. F. Nolde, ed., *Toward World-Wide Christianity* (Interseminary Series), pp. 171–172.
2. R. Niebuhr, *Christianity and Crisis,* Nov. 24, 1947, Vol. VII, No. 20, pp. 5–7.
3. In *Theology Today,* October 1947, p. 323.
4. In O. F. Nolde, ed., *Toward World-Wide Christianity* (Interseminary Series), pp. 73–74.
5. *Ibid.,* p. 54.
6. Kenneth Mackenzie, ed., *Union of Christendom,* pp. 423–424.

THE MESSAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT*

By CLARENCE T. CRAIG

THE arrival in America of the first scholarly religious books to be published in Germany since the war has been awaited with keen anticipation. This volume by Martin Albertz, the New Testament professor at the University of Berlin, is of sufficient interest to warrant a description for American readers. It shows that, though paper and printing have sunk to low levels there, creative scholarship has not died out.

The author's "doctor's thesis," on "The Controversies in the Gospels," was one of the early monographs in the field of "form criticism." From 1921–28 he was the leader of a seminar in preaching and continued his form-criticism studies. From 1935–41 he taught in the ministerial training school of the so-called "confessing Church." Then he was in prison for eighteen months, and again for ten months in 1944–45. He will hardly be accused, therefore, of Nazi sympathies.

The present volume dealing with the genesis of the Gospels is the first half of a treatment on the Message of the New Testament. It is marked by an emphatic rejection of *religionsgeschichtlicheschule* positions. The controlling point of view is that of form criticism. Unfortunately some Americans still have the illusion that this is a dangerously radical position. Would that they could read the exposition by this fundamentally conservative man of Christian faith! The comparative analysis does not go beyond a consideration of the Old Testament and the needs of the early Christian mission. This is in strong contrast to the work of such men as Bultmann and Dibelius. But the kinship in method is clearly recognized.

Albertz would have us begin with the initial presupposition of the Bible concerning a God who speaks, a Word which continues through Christ and the Holy Spirit. The early church did not depend upon a book primarily but upon the spoken word. The author makes an elaborate analysis of the forms of the individual sayings ascribed to

* Martin Albertz, *Die Botschaft des Neun Testamentes,* I Halbband, *Die Entstehung des Evangeliums.* Wichern: Berlin-Spandau 233, 1946.

Jesus. Though he recognizes the presence in our Gospels of occasional words of the risen Lord, he is conservative in the matter of historicity. We have no "sermons" as given by Jesus; rather we have short sayings of a few lines each, like the oracles of the prophets.

The words of Jesus are classified under four groups. But Albertz is not content with mere classification. Throughout he is intent upon bringing out their significance for the Gospel. These groups deal with (1) the law and its consummation; (2) prophecy and its fulfillment; (3) the transformation of wisdom: under this heading he deals with hymns, Psalms, and parables, as well as proverbs and wisdom words in the narrower sense; (4) finally, the self-witness of Christ: the "I am" of the Gospels is to be explained exclusively from the Old Testament and not from any other religious influences.

The Gospel material does not betray psychological interest, any personal description of Jesus, or precise biographical concern. Neither does it contain myths. It begins with theophany and ends with Christophany. The baptism of Jesus is a theophany *to* the Son of God. The resurrection appearances are Christophanies, analogous to the visions by which the prophets were called. Not all Christophanies brought a call to apostolic mission; some only involved recognition of the risen Lord.

Any attempt to understand the Gospel traditions should begin with the resurrection faith. The story of the passion of Jesus was told as a connected whole. This contained no "heroic" features as are ascribed to the Maccabean martyrs. But the miracle stories were always isolated examples of the authority of Jesus. Albertz does not ascribe the formulation of these particularly to the Hellenistic communities. For him, "Hellenist" means the group in Acts 6 and these were from Jerusalem rather than Galilee. Albertz does suggest that in Mark 14 we have Aramaic tradition while Mark 15 is essentially Hellenist.

Some people have assumed that form criticism involved a rejection of the two-source hypothesis. Albertz shows that this is not the case. Following the contemporary consensus, he finds the order of this document in Luke. His reconstruction is generous in the amount of material assigned to Q. He discovers seven divisions of material rather than five as in T. W. Manson. Albertz assumes that Q is the *Logia* which Papias assigned to Matthew. The *Didache* drew directly from Q rather than from any of our Gospels.

The Gospel of Mark is also ascribed to the traditional author,

though Albertz insists that a Gospel has no "author" in the usual sense of the term. He divides the book into three divisions: (1) the secret epiphany of the Son of God (1.1–6.16); (2) the secret epiphany of the suffering Son of Man (6.30–12.44); (3) the fulfillment of the secret epiphany in the passion and resurrection (14.1–16.8). It will be seen that two short interludes divide the three sections. The apocalyptic sheet in Mark 13 is divided into seven sections on "What comes," and seven on "When it comes." Albertz does not explain away eschatology as "realized." "The content of the gospel is the eschatological salvation that had become present through Christ without losing its future character" (p. 139).

The traditional authorship of Luke is also accepted. Luke drew upon both Hellenistic and Biblical backgrounds. Jesus was for him the Savior of the world. The author kept the traditional three-fold division of Mark — Galilee, Wanderings, and Jerusalem — but greatly expands the middle section. In addition to Mark and Q he had three sources. These were the women's group, the relatives of Jesus, and the Hellenists (Acts 6). Albertz plays with the possibility that Cleopas's companion on the road to Emmaus was James the brother of Jesus. The theology of Luke he believes to be pre-Pauline.

The theme of the last of the Synoptic Gospels was "The Thorah of David's Son." Throughout "Matthew," the relationship of the new to the old is prominent. Albertz divides the Gospel into seven speeches and seven narrative sections rather than the adopting five-fold division of B. W. Bacon. The source of the special materials is not found in any one document, but they are Jerusalem traditions. The Gospel originated there in 71. It is the only one for which Albertz postulates a date after the fall of Jerusalem. Both Mark and Luke are assigned to the sixties. He does not discuss the Lukan passages which seem to presuppose the fall of Jerusalem.

Regarding the Fourth Gospel, Albertz does not find the church tradition tenable. He holds that it is quite impossible to identify the author with a Galilean fisherman; he accepts the early martyrdom of the son of Zebedee; the Gospel is written with meager knowledge of Galilee. The author was at the time of Jesus a very young man of priestly descent and from the Baptist circles. After the fall of Jerusalem he went to Asia and wrote the Gospel in his extreme old age. Later he was confused with the apostle John just as Philip the evangelist was confused with the apostle by that name.

Albertz finds the key to the Gospel in the three stanza hymn of the prologue. This is one of three introductory witnesses to Christ. Then there follow three sections, each of which is divided into seven parts, and these subdivided again: (1) "He came to his own" is developed in 2:1–5:47; (2) "His own did not receive him," in 6:1–12:50 (each of the seven sections of this division is developed around an "I" word); (3) "To those who received him, he gave the power to become sons of God," in 13:1–20:31.

Despite its Jewish base, this Gospel is strongly affected by the contemporary Hellenism. But Albertz holds that the Mandean sources, widely exploited in recent years, have no value for its understanding. Here writes an evangelist for whom chronology is quite unimportant (Albertz holds that John is wrong on the date of the death of Jesus). In this gospel, miracles are signs; almost all characters are types. The evangelist is not satisfied with an indirect witness to Christ, as we find it in the Synoptics. He makes explicit the faith of the Church. Narratives and sayings are more completely united than with the earlier tradition, but he does utilize some traditional materials.

The final section of Albertz' book surveys the so-called apocryphal gospels and the problem of the origin of a four-fold canon. This shows that the author is endeavoring to give a full and scholarly account of the origins of the Gospels.

I have reported on the content of this volume so fully that it is inappropriate to take space to enter into a discussion of the validity of individual conclusions. I hope that I have made it clear that though many of the positions represent the consensus that has grown up through the years there is much that is fresh, original, provocative and debatable. The tone is conservative but it shows that historical scholarship has not completely atrophied in Germany, even among leaders of the confessing Church. Concern with the truth of the Bible has not blurred the recognition of differences within it. On the other hand, such a book should make clear to those ecclesiastical officials for whom Germany has been the home of dangerous radicalism that its leading scholars have a very constructive message. The heart of the Gospel will be better understood by anyone who works through this stimulating analysis.

A BOOK ABOUT THE CHURCH*

By Eric H. Wahlstrom

THE last five decades have witnessed a great renaissance of theological research and study in Sweden. It began with Archbishop Nathan Soderblom and Bishop Einar Billing and has been carried on further by Dr. Gustav Aulén, now bishop of Strängnäs, and Dr. Anders Nygren, professor of systematic theology at the University of Lund. Bishop Aulén visited the United States in the spring of 1947 and lectured in several universities and seminaries. His most important book, *The Christian Faith,* has now been published in an English translation by the Muhlenburg Press. Professor Nygren is known to American scholars through the translation of his great work, *Agape and Eros.* He was elected president of the Lutheran World Federation at its meeting in Lund last summer. Since most of the leaders have been connected with the University of Lund, the name Lundensian has been given to this school of theology. It should be understood, however, that members of other faculties and other scholars have shared in the study and research that has made this new and vigorous movement possible.

The Lundensian school is characterized by an intensive study of Luther and by an emphasis on the redemptive activity of God in the Church. God is active in the world to destroy evil, to redeem man, and to create for himself a people. This emphasis on the presence of the living and active God affects the whole content of Christian faith. The concepts of revelation, atonement, justification, sanctification, etc. receive a more vital and dynamic content. The Christian gospel is the message that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," and that he comes today in word and sacraments to redeem man and establish his Kingdom.

It is obvious that this emphasis on the present activity of God would vitally affect the conception of the Church. The nature of the Church thus became the object of much study and research. At first the discussion centered around the conception of the *Volkskirche.* The State Church was being attacked from two directions; from the

* *En bok om kyrkan av svenska teologer.* Lund, 1943, pp. 443. [This article is reprinted with additions, and by permission, from the *Augustana Quarterly,* January, 1948.]

secularized elements in the nation, and from the Free Churches or sects. The State Church appeared to many as simply a department of the state, and the Free Churches seemed to represent a more realistic and purer form of the Church. It was necessary to find a religious foundation for the conception of the *Volkskirche*. The work of Einar Billing was of decisive significance in this situation. He boldly connected the external organization of the Church with the fundamental Christian conception of grace and redemption. His principal thesis was: the Swedish Church is simply the forgiveness of sins offered by grace to the people of Sweden. He pointed out that the very organization and program of the *Volkskirche,* with its geographical boundaries and inclusive membership, express the universal purpose of divine grace. The Church is here and offers its divine riches of grace to all men. No one is compelled to come, but the grace of God is open and free to all who dwell within the boundaries of the Church.

At the present time the discussion about the Church has entered a new phase. Two new factors have appeared which vitally affect the study of the nature of the Church. The exegetical study of the New Testament has been found to be of much more importance for our understanding of the Church than was formerly appreciated. In the days of Billing the problems of introduction, historical criticism, and comparative religion claimed the interest of New Testament scholars. Exegesis contributed little or nothing to the discussion about the Church in his day. In fact, it was a general feeling that the New Testament might be found to be on the side of the Free Churches. It is significant in the present situation that one third of this book about the Church is devoted to the subject, "The Church in the New Testament." The other factors is the general world situation. The Church has again felt the impact of the demonic forces and has been compelled to reconsider its relation to the world. This situation is also to some extent reflected in this present work. The book is divided into three parts: the Church in the New Testament, the historical perspective, and the fundamental conception of the Church; i.e., it is considered from the exegetical, historical, and systematic points of view.

The part dealing with the Church in the New Testament points out the tremendous importance which the New Testament attaches to the concept of the *koinonia.* Dr. Nygren develops this in the first chapter entitled *Corpus Christi.* The answer to the question about the

relation of Christ to the Church is found in the Pauline conception of the Church as the Body of Christ. Christ has brought the new age into the world, he is the Head of the new humanity which belongs to him. But this formula must not be understood in such a way as to divide Christ and the Church, or so as to designate Christ as one part (the Head) and the Church as another part (the Body). "Christ is not the Head merely, but the Head of the Church; the Church is not merely the Body, but the Body of Christ. The Body of Christ is Christ himself. The Church is Christ as he after the resurrection is present among us and meets us here on earth" (p. 20). Where Christ is there is the Church, and where the Church is there is Christ. To belong to the body of Christ is the same as living "in Christ." Fellowship with him implies that we share in his victory over the evil powers from which he sets us free. Dr. Nygren substantiates this with a detailed exegesis of pertinent passages, and suggests that this subject, the Church as the Body of Christ, ought to be given serious consideration by New Testament scholars.

Dr. Anton Fridrichsen supplies two chapters: "The Messiah and Church," and "The Congregations in the New Testament." Jesus did not proclaim himself as the Messiah even though his message concerned the Kingdom of God. The question is whether the Gospels present Jesus as the Lord and King of the Kingdom, and thus indicate that it was his intention to gather a Messianic people. Dr. Fridrichsen finds the evidence for this conception in the call and mission of the Twelve, the words addressed to Peter, the word about the death of the Son of Man for the world, the Last Supper, and the promise of the new covenant. Jesus speaks and acts as the Messiah who "gathers and organizes the people of God in the last days." He refers to his message as an *evangelion, besorá,* which is an eschatological concept. The New Testament congregation is, therefore, the people of God, the elect, the group in whom the Spirit of God is active. It is a *becoming* Church, not a pure and perfect organization. It is a transcendent reality which exists in spite of the failures and shortcomings of the members.

> The historical foundation of this conception of the Church is the teaching of Jesus and his creative-redemptive work through which the Church comes into being. Not the ethical and religious quality of the disciples, but the Son of Man and his work are the powers of the *mysterion* of the Kingdom. Faith, repentance and righteousness are not human achievements through which the Kingdom is created, but they are the pattern according to which those live who have found and received the kingdom (p. 59).

Hugo Odeberg's brief contribution on "Modern Individualism and the Conception of the Church in the New Testament" is a fine example of how vividly the concept of the *koinonia* is recognized in this book. The Church is the primary reality into which each individual member is incorporated. Just as individual branches gathered together on the hillside do not constitute a tree, so neither does an association of people constitute a Church. The Church is primary; it is, as Luther said, "the mother who bears and fosters every member of the Church." Eric Sjöberg discusses the cultus of the Church also from the point of view of the *koinonia*. Baptism is the act whereby the individual is incorporated into the body of Christ, and the Lord's Supper is the sacrament of fellowship with the living Christ and with the brethren.

Olof Linton has an extremely interesting chapter on the ministry in the New Testament. He rejects the older, so-called liberal, interpretation with its emphasis on the individual and his religious experience. This point of view conceived of development according to the following pattern: first was the individual believer, then the individual believers united to form a Church, then the Church was invested with divine sanctions. The ministry followed the same pattern. First there was the believer, then some became leaders and teachers, then they were invested with divine authority, and finally the full-fledged hierarchy of the Roman Church came into being. Both the Church and the ministry were then secondary, a later development, and the individual's experience was primary. Dr. Linton insists that later exegesis has completely reversed this point of view. The Church and the ministry are primary. As Fridrichsen says: "The idea that the object of salvation according to Paul is the individual person has arisen because of a false and superficial interpretation" (p. 60). The Church is the people of God gathered around the Messiah, and the apostles and evangelists are his messengers to bring his gospel into all the world. This leads to the three following propositions: (1) the New Testament ministry involves a participation in the service and authority of Christ; (2) the New Testament ministry is conditional on being in accord with Christ and the Spirit; (3) the New Testament ministry involves service to the brethren (p. 107). From these three points of view Dr. Linton examines the content of the New Testament writings. His conclusion may be summarized thus: "The world, according to the New Testament, is the arena on which a cosmic battle between good and evil, truth and error, God and the devil, is fought. Christ

is the Lord of this struggle, and his messengers participate in it. But no human powers avail here, only he who comes with the authority and power of God can defy the powers of evil" (p. 130). The ministry is a ministry of *the grace of God.* It is not in any sense secondary, but the most essential and vital function of the Church. Nevertheless, the dignity, authority, and power of the ministry belong to the individual simply as a minister of the Word, or of Christ and the Spirit. [The Church of Sweden acknowledges the value and desirability of the historical succession but does not base the authority of the ministry on this tradition.]

The last two chapters in Part I deal with "The Church and the Kingdom," and "Membership in the New Testament Church." In the first of these, Gösta Lindeskog represents a rather exclusive emphasis on the eschatological viewpoint. "Jesus' function was to call men into and to save them for the Kingdom. This is also the function of the Church. The Kingdom is not yet, but its powers are active in Jesus and in the Church. . . . The Kingdom is the only exclusively *eschatological* concept in the New Testament" (p. 142). The question of membership in the Church is answered along the line of the *koinonia.* The emphasis is not on individual qualifications, but on the redemptive activity of God through which the *koinonia* is created. They are members of the Church, not because they have produced "fruit," but in order that they may bear fruit.

I have dealt rather extensively with this part of the book because it represents a new departure in Swedish theological research. During the last few decades the center of interest has been in the study of Luther, and the New Testament writings have received very little attention. There seems to be a new awareness that Luther himself points back to the New Testament, and that the central task of theology is the interpretation of the gospel of Christ. All of these chapters have been written by men who have specialized in the field of the New Testament, and each one contains a detailed exegesis of the passages dealing with the subject. The remarkable unity, which is evident in the whole book, is produced by the prominent place given to the idea of the *koinonia,* which is, after all, nothing else than the Church of Jesus Christ. This theme of the fellowship of the New Testament Church is developed with the enthusiasm of a new discovery. They have found that Billing's and Luther's concept of the Church is the common conception in the New Testament.

The second Part is written by church historians and deals mostly with the historical development in Sweden. The titles of the chapters are as follows: The Doctrine of the Church, the Primitive Confession, the Confession in the Swedish Church of the Reformation, the Church and the Confessions in the Last Century, Church and State in the Swedish Tradition, the Renaissance of the Conception of the Church, Einar Billing's Conception of the Church, Continuity and Discontinuity in the Church. One interesting aspect of this Part is the discussion of the place of the confessions in the Lutheran Church. Some have argued that the number of confessions should be reduced, and at least that the Formula of Chalcedon and the Formula of Concord should be eliminated. It was Billing who insisted that a short confessional formula would be a legalistic chain that would bind the conscience of the believer. Through this struggle the significance of the confessions has been clarified. They are not regarded as legalistic rules, but as an expression of the faith of the Church derived from and ultimately dependent upon Scripture.

The third Part deals with the doctrine of the Church from the systematic point of view. Subjects discussed are: the Subjective and Objective Elements in the Conception of the Church, the Visibility and the Invisibility of the Church according to Luther, the Church and Baptism, the Lutheran Conception of the Lord's Supper, the Ministry, Living in the Church, the Church and the Vocation, Church and State, the Church and the Judicial (Social) Order, and the Unity of the Church. The attitude of the Lutheran Church to the Ecumenical Movement is clarified by Bishop Aulén in the last chapter. A brief quotation may suffice to indicate this. In the relation between the Churches this twofold rule should apply: "The Church must not obscure or surrender any Christian insight into divine truth; and, all self-sufficiency, self-assertiveness and religious pride must be eliminated" (p. 434). The starting point for all ecumenical discussion is the actual unity of the Church as the body of Christ.

Every one of these chapters is thorough, interesting, and scholarly, and testifies to both the piety and the erudition of these theologians. The book might well serve as a model for similar studies in other denominations. The criticisms which might be levelled against it are not concerned with the contents, but rather with what is lacking in a discussion about the Church in this day and age. There is very little evidence that these theologians are concerned about the precarious

situation of the Church in the world today. Bishop Aulén states in the Introduction that the problems of the Church cannot be solved by an exegesis of the New Testament. The significance of the conception of the Church must be systematically clarified, and this conception must be applied to the situation of the present day. But it is at this point that the book fails. The only one who tries to approach the contemporary situation is Bishop Aulén himself in his chapter on "The Church and the Judicial Order." It is typical of the whole book that Dr. Nygren in his chapter on Church and State deals with Luther's conception of the state as a means through which God works in the world. That the Church has lost the allegiance of the masses, that church attendance is at a low ebb, that the conception of the social order and the state have changed during the last few decades, that large sections of Europe have gone back to paganism — these and similar problems have found no place in this book. It may, of course, be answered that this book has been written from the point of view of exegetical, historical, and systematic theology, but one would have a right to expect that a "Book about the Church" should have something to say about the function of the Church in the world. If the Church stands in this terrific struggle between God and the devil, then there ought to be some thought given to strategy, methods, and objectives. This book furnishes abundant proof that the accusation of quietism levelled against the Lutheran Church is at least partially true. Here is a grand conception of the Church, but it ought to be followed by a volume that would address itself to the practical problems of the Church and the world in this day and generation.

CONTEMPORARY BOOKS

INTRODUCTIONS TO JESUS

TOWARD THE UNDERSTANDING OF JESUS, *by* VLADIMIR G. SIMKHOVITCH. *The Macmillan Company, $2.75.*

AN INTRODUCTION TO JESUS FOR THE TWENTIETH CENTURY, *by* R. W. STEWART. *The Macmillan Company, $1.75.*

JESUS: WHAT MANNER OF MAN, *by* HENRY J. CADBURY. *The Macmillan Company, $2.25.*

THIS trio of books, coming so soon after the completion of Professor John Knox's trilogy on New Testament Christology and President Colwell's book (reviewed in the Winter Number), seems to indicate that no change has taken place in the church's interest in this perennial subject. Not the war, nor the post-war (we cannot call it peace), nor the problems created by the atomic bomb, nor Russia, nor the United Nations, nor the economic conflict now raging here in America — none of these has succeeded in shifting our interest away from this age-old question. Indeed, it seems more relevant than ever. For if we are ever to get out of the mess we are in, it is the Gospel of Jesus which promises most in the way of solution, of peace, of the eventual realization, not of the Kingdom of God but of some kind of life here on this earth which will be not too far removed from the divine Reign.

It is this relevance that forms the subject of Professor Simkhovitch's new Preface. (The book first appeared in 1921, and has been reprinted nineteen times!) We have our choice, and

> even if we do forget our ancient history we do know the story of the recent decades. Do we for a moment believe that the evils they have brought can be rectified without a new approach, without a change of attitude? This has not been the experience of the past. It may be less of a phantasy to believe that the world will be destroyed than to believe in a change of mind. Perhaps through fateful experience alone will the world be forced at last to accept the teachings of the rejected of men.

The main point of the book is that a genuine historical understanding of Jesus requires a new approach, distinct from the "historicism" which ruled the late nineteenth century. This approach is "functional": Jesus is to be set against the background — or rather in the very midst — of his own times. Only then can we hope to discover what he meant by his words, and what he meant to do in his mission. The author presents a detailed account of the political situation in Jesus' lifetime, relying very largely on Josephus. It is unfortunate that he has not paid equal attention to economic conditions: some account of the latter would have reinforced his argument, and

the reader would have had the advantage of an expert economist's interpretation of the data. He seems to have a blind spot for apocalyptic (e.g., p. 39) — no one can read all the literature of the time and ignore this factor! — and he evidently looks upon literary and historical criticism (he calls it "text-criticism"!) as a waste of time. John and the Synoptics are on the same level. And there are blunders in statement of fact: the Sadducees "denied . . . the immortality of the soul" (p. 41); John was put to death "for announcing the coming of Christ" (p. 69). The core of Jesus' teaching was that "the kingdom was to be within us" (p. 82). It is a pity that a book as important and as widely read as this one should not have been revised before being reissued. At least the misprints should have been corrected (an egregious one on the last line of p. 14!), if only by a list of corrigenda.

Two important economic essays are included: "Rome's Fall Reconsidered" and "Hay and History." This has puzzled some readers — and reviewers — but the point is that soil-exhaustion has been a determining factor in social and political history. Though it is not stated, this factor was also involved in the mounting crisis within first-century Palestine (as I tried to show, long ago, in my *Economic Background of the Gospels,* Oxford, 1926). If Jesus really was an agrarian, a man of the people, one who lived among them and felt their needs at first hand, indeed shared their outlook (see Samuel Cohon's oft-quoted essay on "The Place of Jesus in the Religious Life of His Day" in *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 48 (1929); 82–108 or W. Bauer's "Jesus der Galiläer" in the *Festschrift für Adolf Jülicher,* 1927), then the whole situation, including the economic, and not just the political (which brought it to a crisis) requires to be considered.

Dr. Stewart's volume represents an earnest effort to rid the historical Jesus of the patristic and mediaeval "regalia of the creeds." But his equipment for the task is not quite adequate. He mixes later conditions with earlier — e.g. in describing the conditions of the *am-ha-aretz* in Jesus' time (pp. 8, 17). John the Baptist is "the prophet of the liberal movement in Judaism" (p. 126). In adopting the phrase, Son of Man, "with its dreamy yet magnificent associations," Jesus was "exploring the realms of fantasy in search of imagery to convey his truth" (p. 16). The Platonic tradition had a very bad influence on the church: it was responsible for the creeds (p. 114)! But blessed be modern science — it has restored chance as an elemental factor in the universe (p. 119). But has it? Or is it really chance? And even if we say yes to both questions, is it a blessing? All this is mingled with some very good things: e.g. the recognition that the term Messiah "did have a political significance" (p. 55). But this is really a subject which a writer who depends entirely upon secondary sources (or tertiary, like many contemporary books) simply cannot handle, and ought not to try.

Professor Cadbury's competence is unquestioned: he has long been one

of the world's leading New Testament scholars. But his book is scarcely "an introduction to Jesus." The title of the book is in form a question, and so are the chapter-headings: Is not this Jesus? Whence this wisdom? Why speakest thou in parables? What is this? — New teaching! How knoweth this man? By what authority? Instead of answers to all these questions, instead of an attempt at biography, or even a sketch of Jesus' career, or an account of Jesus' teaching, Dr. Cadbury deals with the prolegomena, with the conditions that attend any attempt to answer them: the positive affirmations are limited to certain generalizations of probabilities. On the basis of the tradition recorded in the Gospels, Jesus' mind and personality can be made out to some degree — though the tradition moved in different directions, under the stimulus of a variety of interests, and its final editors (the evangelists) had each a specific viewpoint of his own. The fact that Jesus' words were addressed to individuals, for the most part, and on definite occasions, and that these original settings have not been recorded; that the specific has been generalized, as teaching for the use of the church — all this often makes it extremely difficult to say precisely what was their original meaning. And Dr. Cadbury, being an honest historian, is compelled to recognize these difficulties.

Some readers may be disappointed — they would like a brief summary of "the assured results of criticism"; instead, the author makes it clear that there are no short-cuts, and that the "results of criticism" are not altogether assured. To read this book is like a stinging cold shower on a hot day — a man with low blood-pressure, or weak faith, had better keep out of it! But if the reader will only realize that from the first Christianity has been a faith rather than a body of knowledge or a set of philosophical or theological *dogmata;* that the Gospels are not biographies, but books of tradition put together to support the church's proclamation of the good news of salvation; that the modern interest in history and biography was not shared by the early Palestinian church — then the reader will emerge from the cold bath refreshed and stimulated, rather than depressed. For the expert, the theologian, this book by an expert in lexicography and interpretation is indispensable if he is going to deal with the Gospel tradition as it actually exists, and not to solve by other methods, or by hypothesis or fancy, the real problems it sets — not for the believer but for the historian.

FREDERICK C. GRANT

CHRIST AS EVENT AND AS INTERPRETATION

ON THE MEANING OF CHRIST, *by* JOHN KNOX. *Charles Scribner's Sons, $2.50.*

THIS brief book contains the 1947 Noble Lectures delivered at Harvard by Professor Knox of Union Seminary. It completes a series of studies of Christ which includes *The Man Christ Jesus* (1941) and *Christ the Lord*

(1945). The theme announced in the first volume, "that the theological interpretation of Christ is not so divorced from the historical Jesus as is often supposed," is developed here into a theological analysis of Christ, and primarily the "event" of Christ.

> The reality with which we are concerned appears under no fewer than three aspects: (1) as the event or closely knit series of events in and through which God made Himself known; (2) as the person who was the center of that event or complex of events; and (3) as the community which both came into existence with the event and provided the locus of it (p. 19).

Knox stresses the significance of "event" for the understanding of the revelation and arranges his book around it. The central event includes "the personality, life and teaching of Jesus, the response of loyalty he awakened, his death, his resurrection, the coming of the Spirit, the faith with which the Spirit was received, the creation of the community" (p. 34). While stress later comes to be laid on a doctrine of incarnation, the New Testament itself prefers something like "event," to which it records the response. The crucial event is the resurrection, which — unlike the many "miracles" reported in Jesus' earthly career — actually took place. The miracle-stories are written from a post-resurrection point of view. "Every miracle is indeed a miniature transfiguration scene" (p. 80). The whole event becomes transfigured in the "story" of the pre-existent and ascended Christ — a story essentially true but hardly historical! Finally, "in so far as we know Christ, we know him in and through the life of the community" (p. 98). The Church is the continuation of the event.

There is little in Knox's work with which the New Testament student will wish to find fault. The New Testament itself is the creation of the Church, and can hardly be understood apart from it. Yet Knox rightly insists on the necessity for the "quest for the historical Jesus" (p. 64), and he endeavors to make the quest. Perhaps, however, one could argue that in these three books theology has submerged history, although this apparent victory may be simply a question of emphasis. But I miss some of the historical reality of Jesus of Nazareth. And in the praises of the Church as the resurrection community I miss some of the despair and grandeur of the cross, some of the blasted hopes of the disciples, if not of Jesus himself. The tragedy was temporary; but it was an essential part of the event.

When we have made this criticism we have touched only a part of the book, which is a highly significant attempt to bridge the gap between Biblical studies and theology. No New Testament student should miss it. It makes us aware once more that Knox's three books are among the most important Christological studies of our day.

ROBERT M. GRANT

CONFRONTATION AND DECISION

THE MEANING OF EXISTENCE, *by* CHARLES D. KEAN. *Harper and Brothers. $3.00.*

THIS is one of the first books — at any rate, amongst those known to the reviewer — in which an attempt is made to take the existential point of view, so vigorously maintained by continental philosophers of recent years, and stemming ultimately from Kierkegaard, and to relate this new philosophical orientation to the total Christian position. For this reason, one's opinion of the book will be determined, in large measure, by one's sympathy or dislike for the existential outlook. But even for those who think that "existentialism," in its strictly philosophical sense, has been somewhat over-estimated, Mr. Kean's study is still of value. For scattered through its pages are extraordinarily interesting and sometimes novel "insights" which deserve careful and thoughtful attention.

Heidegger's insistence that all thinking involves the whole of man as a mortal being ("I think as one who is to die"), coupled with the emphasis found in the re-discovered Kierkegaard but by no means confined to his writings, is probably increasingly asserted by all who do not belong to what Robin Collingwood called the "school of minute philosophers." The admission that there is a profound element of "subjectivism" in every attempt of man to employ his reasoning powers, has led us all to feel a certain dissatisfaction with purely conceptual theologizing, as it has also led us to insist that religion must have a dynamic and vital quality, both as relationship to the Real (whatever that may be) and as action in the world (however that may be expressed). Now it is precisely this double quality which Mr. Kean insists, for himself and rightly, that we must take into our apologetic for Christianity. *This* is a vital concern; it is in *this* that I have an interest; it is by *this* rather than *that* attitude, orientation, adjustment to the nature of things that I shall be able really to live rather than merely to be. Such is to be our approach to the whole problem of Christianity in the world today. Decision, then, is required. But decision must be on some basis, and it is the Christian contention that the meaning of existence to which we must be vitally related is spoken out for us in the "myth" of Christ. This "myth" — the term being used without prejudice to historic truth — is "the description of man's existence in terms of a story related to history but oriented toward eternity." To be confronted with it poses man with his fundamental problem: to affirm or to deny. If he affirms, he may live meaningfully; if he denies, his life is reduced to insignificance and futility.

Such, in other words, is Mr. Kean's line of thought. The reviewer would say, by way of adverse criticism, that it does not seem adequately integrated into the whole traditional scheme of Christian theology, on the one hand, nor into the essential witness of the *philosophia perennis,* on the other.

Doubtless Mr. Kean might regard that as a compliment rather than an attack. Nevertheless, this is a *way* of seeing Christianity and of presenting it, living and demanding, in our own time. So far, it is splendid. But in the long run, even existentialism is bound to come to terms with the question of truth; when it does seek to arrive at such an understanding, it may yet have to recognize that there is much more to be said. In the meanwhile, we are grateful to Mr. Kean for giving a clear and useful expression of a prevalent mood, and for seeking earnestly and with considerable success to state the Christian Gospel in a fashion relevant to that mood.

W. Norman Pittenger

RELIGION'S GREATEST CHANCE

Modern Nationalism and Religion, *by* Salo Wittmayer Baron. *Harper & Brothers, $5.00.*

THIS is the scholarly type of book one would expect from Dr. Baron, who occupies a chair of Jewish history, literature and institutions at Columbia University. It embodies the Rauschenbusch Lectures for 1944, much elaborated and embellished with copious notes. It is no source for readymade generalizations or for polemics against "the state." Intellectually impatient readers may lay it down quickly – to their loss.

"Modern nationalism," says Dr. Baron, "has displaced religion as the chief factor in human group relationships." Yet this nationalism is not a monolithic phenomenon, to be set over against religion. Rather, it is a blend of political and cultural elements in which religion is an appreciable factor. Indeed, the author speaks of political *and* cultural nationalism and finds religion more akin to the latter, influencing it in ambivalent fashion. "Even today it is the ultimate source of the cultural nationalists' underlying conviction of the superiority of moral values over political convenience, as well as of much of their intrinsic intolerance and heresy hunting."

Dr. Baron calls Rousseau, Burke, Jefferson, Fichte and Mazzini the "fathers" of modern nationalism, and classifies Maurras, Mussolini and Rosenberg as "epigoni" – less creative spirits who, ironically enough, brought nationalism to its horrible blood-and-soil climax. The uncertain line that separates political and cultural nationalism from religious universalism is tragically revealed in Fichte, who was a "fervent Christian preacher" with a humanitarian heart, yet who "pointed the way to the marshaling of all German forces around the nation and its peculiar type of religion which, he believed, would ultimately be accepted by the world at large." Jefferson is depicted as more freethinker than churchman, who entertained the notion of an Anglo-Saxon civilization embracing the Western Hemisphere and failed to recognize its "incongruously imperialistic nature."

Taking up systematically the four major religious systems of the Western world Dr. Baron thus characterizes their several orientations to his subject: Catholic interterritorialism, Protestant individualism, Orthodox caesaro-papism, and Jewish ethnicism. As might be expected because of its claim to a supranational sovereignty the Catholic Church has been more concerned with political than with cultural nationalism. Of its partial involvement in the totalitarian complex, the author says: "It stands to reason that, were it not for [its] overpowering fear of communism, the Catholic Church would have more effectively counteracted the spread of the new paganism." In spite of "serious lapses into nationalist frenzy," the Catholic Church has "adhered to its international outlook." Its gains, Dr. Baron finds, have been most conspicuous in countries where it was in a minority position and hence less involved in nationalistic aspirations.

Protestantism in its relation to nationalism exhibits some strange paradoxes. The Reformation — and the counter-Reformation — contributed both to nationalism and to internationalism.

> Luther's intrinsically Germanic and nationalist outlook was still strongly overlaid with a medieval crust of Catholic universality. Calvin's intrinsic internationalism, on the other hand, was temporarily obscured by the facade of a theocratically controlled church-state. Strewn on different national soils and growing in progressively different social and intellectual climates, the seeds sown by the great reformers developed into plants of a fantastically different coloring and texture.

The present ecumenical drive is calculated to moor the United Nations "in the free individual conscience and the full autonomy of all denominational and national groups." The American Protestant churches, it is noted, have kept officially aloof from ultranationalist movements such as Know-Nothingism, the K.K.K., and America First. Indeed, "some Protestant leaders have become the outstanding champions of a true brotherhood of man transcending racial and national boundaries."

Space is lacking for more than mention of the emergence of "messianic nationalism" out of the discarded caesaro-papism of the old Russian Church, and the author's illuminating and dispassionate account of ethnic-religious nationalism and political internationalism as found combined in Judaism. The Zionist issue is discussed with a marked degree of historic objectivity.

Christian theologians will see in the author's tracing of the historical interpenetration of religion and nationalism the continual upsurge of the demonic into the religious consciousness, as the authentic appeal of particular elemental loyalties has itself obscured the universalistic and supranational character of all ethical religion. Religion is always thus assisting in its own frustration. Yet in the present world situation, when nationalism

whether political or cultural has been proved a frail support for human rights, the author sees religion's "greatest chance." But in order to take advantage of this chance the religious bodies must participate in a process of "agonizing self-purification."

F. Ernest Johnson

PRAYER AND ITS PRACTICE

Prayer and the Lord's Prayer, *by* Charles Gore. *Harper & Brothers, $1.25.*
Doctor Johnson's Prayers, *edited by* Elton Trueblood. *Harper & Brothers, $1.50.*

THESE two books may appropriately be reviewed together, since they are issued simultaneously by the same publisher in the same general format, and deal, from different aspects, with one great concern of the human spirit, namely, the meaning and reality of prayer. The second volume is a little larger than the other, but each one, attractively printed and bound in cloth, with gold labels, is small enough to be slipped into a coat pocket.

Though Bishop Gore's book was first published a half a century ago, not only its subject but also its manner of treatment are such that — with the exception of a few minor allusions and references — it seems as contemporary as though it were written now. It is prefaced with a brief introduction by Angus Dun, the Bishop of Washington, in which there is included these significant words of Bishop Gore, "The purpose of God is to do in us and through us more than we imagine, but He can only carry out His purpose if we are responsive." These words are followed by the comment of one of Gore's biographers: "Prayer and practice were interwoven in the fabric of his daily life."

The book begins with three introductory chapters on The Efficacy of Prayer, Prayer in Christ's Name, and What May We Pray For, in the third of which is included a particularly interesting consideration by Bishop Gore of the question whether it is right and reasonable to pray for such material, direct blessings as safety, recovery of health, or even favorable weather. Following these chapters, Bishop Gore considers the Lord's Prayer clause by clause. In his meditation upon the petition "They kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven" one notes the characteristic *high* emphasis which Bishop Gore gives to the church. In the church, he says, Christ's kingdom has already implicitly come. But his churchmanship was not isolated or conventional. As he himself expressed it, he was seeking "a world in which none shall be exploited and there shall be equality of opportunity for all."

Samuel Johnson, perhaps the most famous and influential figure in Eng-

lish literature in the eighteenth century, wrote from time to time many religious meditations and prayers. These were first published in 1785, shortly after his death. The prayers themselves have now been sifted out from his longer collection, and are here printed under various classifications and preceded by an especially interesting introduction by Dr. Elton Trueblood, to whom also the editing and arrangement are due.

Johnson reflected the eighteenth century aversion to anything which seemed fanatical. One word in particular, which we use in commendation, had for him and for his time an entirely disapproving note. He once wrote of Addison "As a teacher of wisdom, he may be confidently followed. His religion has nothing in it *enthusiastic* or superstitious; he appears neither weakly credulous nor wantonly skeptical; his morality is neither dangerously lax nor impracticably rigid." Thus Johnson was a typical Britisher in his dislike of what he regarded as extreme. But planted on what seemed to him unshakable middle ground, he was a person of no mild opinions, but one ready for sturdy and indignant championship of all that he believed in. Boswell wrote of him, as Dr. Trueblood in his introduction reminds us, that "he would not tamely suffer" Christian principles to be questioned; and another one of his friends declared that he paid no attention to the ordinary inhibitions of politeness when anyone depreciated religion or morality.

The prayers are arranged by Dr. Trueblood under such headings as these: Amendment of Life, Work and Study, Health of Body and Mind, Family and Friends. Then there are groups of prayers related to special occasions and times. All of them are profoundly affected by the form and language of the Book of Common Prayer, which Johnson intimately knew, and the reverent dignity of which his own petitions echo. Yet in referring to the form of his prayers, it must emphatically be said that they are not primarily literary compositions framed on the surface of a man's thoughts. They come from deep down in Johnson's own nature where he was wrestling in sturdy and sometimes agonized honesty with his own problems of work and duty and life and death. As Dr. Trueblood has said, "He understood the cross." . . . Accordingly the prayers "are free from the easy faith which comes too quickly to its goal. His prayers are great, partly because they partake of the nature of tragedy."

These prayers, their depths and their loftiness, must be read in full to be rightly appreciated. But their quality may be revealed in this prayer written a little over a month after his wife's death:

AFTER THIRTY-NINE DAYS

O Lord, our heavenly Father, without whom all purposes are frustrate, all efforts are vain, grant me the assistance of thy Holy Spirit, that I may not

sorrow as one without hope, but may now return to the duties of my present state with humble confidence in thy protection, and so govern my thoughts and actions, that neither business may withdraw my mind from Thee, nor idleness lay me open to vain imaginations; that neither praise may fill me with pride, nor censure with discontent; but that in the changes of this life, I may fix my heart upon the reward which Thou has promised to them that serve Thee, and that whatever things are true, whatever are pure, whatever are lovely, whatever are of good report, wherein there is virtue, wherein there is praise, I may think upon and do, and obtain mercy and everlasting happiness. Grant this, O Lord, for the sake of Jesus Christ. Amen.

W. Russell Bowie

CHURCH ORDER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The Pastoral Epistles, *Introduction, Translation, Commentary and Word Studies, by* Burton Scott Easton. *Charles Scribner's Sons, $3.00.*

HERE is at last a genuinely critical commentary in English on the Pastoral Epistles. It is especially to be welcomed because it is written by a distinguished Protestant Episcopal scholar. In days when these letters figure prominently in ecclesiastical debates, it is interesting to have such an objective work from this source.

Easton gives a clear refutation of the possibility of Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. He makes no attempt to isolate "genuine" passages, though the use of various traditional materials is recognized. He supports the frequent contention that the letters were written in the order: II Timothy, Titus, and I Timothy. Since the Church Order is not so developed as in Ignatius, he dates I Timothy about 105 A.D.

The letters were written to meet the corrupting invasion of false teachings due to Oriental dualism and the beginnings of Gnosticism in the Christian Church. Since the author wrote against all its forms there is no clear picture of any one system. He certainly did not write against Marcion, specifically for most of the material is irrelevant as far as Marcion is concerned.

The real author of the Pastorals was a man of Hellenistic upbringing who was clearly not at home in the Old Testament. He combined terminology from Judaism and Hellenism. He was opposed to all forms of speculative inquiry, pleading for the acceptance of the faith as a trust committed by the apostles. The author knew and honored the Paul in whose name he wrote but did not understand him. Even in Titus 3.4–7 he failed to transmit Paul's actual doctrine.

Easton gives a fresh translation of the Epistles. Unfortunately he divides the commentary on each section into two divisions. Though these deal with different types of comment, this makes for an irritating division of treatment. In many ways the most valuable section is that devoted to Word

Studies. They bring to the English reader considerable material not hitherto available. Among the interesting interpretations is that of the phrase "married only once." Easton believes that it excludes those who have been divorced by their heathen mates from holding office if they remarry.

Most important of all is the discussion of Church Order and the Ministry. He says:

> It is now generally agreed that there is no term in the New Testament that describes a bishop in the Ignatian or later sense; and it is also generally agreed that the apostolate *as such* was so personal to its holder that it could not be transferred to another person by ordination (p. 173).

I am much less sure of the "general agreement" than I am of the truth of those positions. Easton translates *episcopos* as "ruler" in order to avoid confusion with all that the term "bishop" conveys to a modern reader. They held minor administrative responsibilities.

The institution of Elders was derived from the Jewish precedents in Palestine; it is an anachronism for the Pauline churches. Jewish Elders had no part in the synagogue service: their function was to preserve the correct interpretation of Halakah. The idea of such a succession was taken over into the Church but "precisely how the Christian succession began is unknown and unknowable" (p. 226). Elders presupposed an established tradition which requires interpretation. "When the apostles had passed away, the work of the elders began" (225).

"Timothy" — that is, the type of Church official to whom "Paul" is writing — is a bishop in everything but name, but he is ordained not by other bishops but by the presbytery. In other words, the Pastorals show us a Church on the road toward Ignatius, not following a prescribed pattern but meeting its own needs under the guidance of the Spirit.

CLARENCE T. CRAIG

MODERN BIBLICAL RESEARCH SUMMARIZED

THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE TODAY AND TOMORROW, *edited by* HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY. *University of Chicago Press, $6.00.*

THIS is a series of twenty-four essays designed to indicate the general position at which Biblical research has arrived and to suggest the areas where further exploration is most urgently called for. The essays are with few exceptions written by members, past or present, of the Chicago Society for Biblical Research, an organization of Biblical scholars in the neighborhood of Chicago, founded by William Rainey Harper in 1892 and with a record of continuous activity and distinguished achievement since that time. The essays are divided evenly as between those called "General

Surveys of Main Areas" and "Special Studies of Salient Problems." In the first section, Raymond A. Bowman writes on "Old Testament Research between the Great Wars"; J. Coert Rylaarsdam, on "Intertestamental Studies since Charles's Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha": Merrill M. Parvis on "New Testament Criticism in the World-Wars Period"; G. Ernest Wright, on "The Present State of Biblical Archeology"; Felix A. Levy, on "Contemporary Trends in Jewish Bible Study"; James H. Cobb, on "Current Trends in Catholic Biblical Research"; Ovid R. Sellers, on "The Status and Prospects of Research Concerning the Psalms"; Harry M. Orlinsky, on "Current Progress and Problems in Septuagint Research"; W. F. Albright, on "The War in Europe and the Future of Biblical Studies"; Frederick C. Prussner, on "Problems Ahead in Old Testament Research"; Ralph Marcus, on "The Future of Intertestamental Studies"; and Paul Schubert, on "Urgent Tasks for New Testament Research." In the second section, Chester C. McCown writes on "The Geographical Conditioning of Religious Experience in Palestine"; William A. Irwin, on "Revelation in the Old Testament"; A. Haire Forster, on "Propaganda Analysis Applied to Alexandrian-Jewish Apologetic"; Paul E. Davies, on "The Relevance of Apocalyptic for Ancient and Modern Situations"; Frederick C. Grant, on "The Teachings of Jesus and First-Century Jewish Ethics"; Donald W. Riddle, on "Reassessing the Religious Importance of Paul"; Floyd V. Filson, on "The Central Problem Concerning Christian Origins"; Sherman E. Johnson, on "The Emergence of the Christian Church in the Precatholic Period"; Arthur E. Hays, on "The Role of the Bible in the Reformation"; Allen Paul Wikgren, on "A Critique of the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament"; Otto J. Baab, on "Old Testament Theology: Its Possibility and Methodology"; and Amos N. Wilder, on "New Testament Theology in Transition."

It is obviously impossible for one person to write an adequate review of so rich and wide-ranging a symposium. This would be true even if vastly more space were allowed to this review than could be assigned. One can scarcely do more than register an enthusiastic judgment that the editor and the several writers have been amazingly successful in accomplishing the comprehensive task they set themselves and that the essays are interesting and illuminating, even when, as was often the case with the present reviewer, one is not competent to offer a critical judgment.

The book will be valuable for several classes of readers: for scholars in some one part of the Biblical field who wish to be brought up to date on what is happening in other parts of that field or who want help in understanding and formulating the significance of what is happening in their own; for prospective Biblical scholars who need guidance into the areas where important creative work needs still to be done; and for teachers, min-

isters, and students of religion generally, who may wish to know the present position of Biblical studies.

This position, the reader of this book will soon see, is not static. Nowhere is it presupposed that Biblical research has reached a resting place. Some results have been fairly securely established, but many old solutions of old problems have been discredited but not replaced, and new problems are constantly appearing. The mood of this book is not complacency in what has already been accomplished, but eager interest in what needs still to be done in one of the most fascinating and exciting fields of humanitarian and theological study.

It should certainly be added that one of the most significant contributions of the book is the demonstration it makes of how fruitful a regional association of scholars can be.

JOHN KNOX

GOSPEL FOR THE GENTILES

PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS, *by* E. F. SCOTT. *Charles Scribner's Sons.*

IT is really remarkable how much material Dr. Scott has managed to concentrate within the narrow confines of this little volume of only 121 pages. In clear and dynamic language he sets forth the message of this great epistle and makes it as real and vivid for modern readers as it must have been for the contemporary Romans originally addressed.

The book is divided into four parts: the origin and purpose of the epistle, the commentary, the central teaching, and the value of the epistle for today. Dr. Scott holds that the primary purpose of the letter was to secure the support of the Roman church for Paul's contemplated mission to the West. This makes it a missionary document in which the apostle emphasizes the universality of the Gospel and the need for sending out preachers into all the world.

The commentary is brief, but the analysis is clear and penetrating. Dr. Scott is convinced that Paul is not engaged in arid discussions of metaphysical speculations and intellectual dogmas, but that his main purpose at all times is to set forth the reality of his experience of the grace of God in Christ. Man's greatest need is to come into a right relationship with God, and the possibility of this new relationship is given in the death and resurrection of Jesus. His thoughts and his arguments are cast in the forms familiar to him from his Jewish training, but Dr. Scott points out that he would have expressed himself substantially in the same way even if he had come to the knowledge of Christ from a pagan background (p. 46). The center of his message is the grace of God in Christ. God is not unknown and remote: he has revealed himself in Christ and he is active in the present

to redeem and sanctify his people. This present and continuous redemptive activity of God is the central fact of the Gospel. This is the *kerygma,* the proclamation of the work of God. In making this proclamation Paul has to use a number of analogies and figures of speech, but these are merely the vessels in which the essential message is contained. The vessels are "earthly," but the message is the power of God unto salvation.

It is this constant emphasis on God's redeeming and recreating activity that makes the Epistle to the Romans relevant to every age, and not least to our own. The Gospel which he proclaimed is the Gospel for today, the good news that God is living and active, and is able to set men free from all powers of evil and to transfer them into "the kingdom of the Son of his love."

Dr. Scott has done a real service to all students of Paul in preparing this book. All too often Paul's message has been hidden behind academic arguments on fine points of doctrine, which Paul himself would have impatiently brushed aside. He was a preacher and a missionary, but he was also a theologian who grappled with the difficult problems presented by the revelation of God and man's attitude to the Gospel. It is the merit of Dr. Scott's book that it brings the message of Paul into the realities of the present and thus makes the Epistle to the Romans meaningful and significant for today.

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM

CONCEPTUAL THEOLOGIZING IN A DESPERATE DAY

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GRACE, *by* OSCAR HARDMAN. *The Macmillan Company, $2.00.*

IN a day when God's wrath has been so obvious, it is not strange that theologians have succeeded more vividly in awakening response — both among Christians and thoughtful secularists — to their calls to repentance than to their assurances of grace. We have heard but few moving pronouncements of grace, most often, significantly, from the persecuted churches. This book by an Anglican theologian, though lacking the convincing expression of the great theologians of grace — Paul, Augustine, Luther, and Wesley — may be highly valuable in clarifying the understanding of readers already convinced that the language of theology means something.

After summarizing concisely the history of the doctrine, Hardman develops it topically. Grace, closely associated with the love of God, is conceived as "the power of the Personality of the Creator working upon the personality of each of His creatures by the means which we commonly

describe as personal influence" (p. 85). Vindicating the goodness of God against conceptions of arbitrary predestination, the author states that God calls all, but only some respond; the difference falls within human responsibility.

Although he discusses various views in a non-polemical spirit, Hardman comes down on the Catholic side of most issues. He assumes Thomist ideas of the eternity, knowledge, and perfection of God. "Original sin" is explained in its mildest form, the softened Thomism of the Council of Trent. "Fallen" man has lost a supernatural bias toward good; his nature is enfeebled, not depraved; he desires to do good and sorrows when he fails. Many will feel that this interpretation misses some authentic Christian insights. Certainly it lacks the powerful "dialectical" feeling of a Pascal: "If man is not made for God, why is he only happy in God? If man is made for God, why is he so opposed to God?"

On the issue of sanctification, the author accepts the Catholic doctrine of "infused grace," protesting however against confusions occasioned by the metaphorical language. He points, with good reason, to difficulties within Protestant statements of the doctrine of justification — difficulties still evident in contemporary writers. While rightly criticizing the complacency of the Protestant who is sure that he is saved, Hardman fails to understand Luther's profound appreciation of the opposition between fear for oneself and trust in God. He also affirms the Catholic idea of a hierarchy of spiritual accomplishment among the redeemed.

Hardman's short book lacks the power and insight of some of the dynamic theological writing of our time. His more academic presentation shows up issues where others' statements are not adequate, and should be useful in its own right.

ROGER L. SHINN

THE INEXPLICABLE WONDER OF SAINTHOOD

THE PATH OF THE SAINT. ANONYMOUS. *With Introduction by* PRESIDENT E. MCNEILL POTEAT. *Harper & Brothers, $2.50.*

IT cannot be said that sainthood is any longer a popular ideal in American religious thought. Nor is this difficult to understand. For, firstly, the Social Gospel gained in socialistic colouring until in its sunset tint it is almost indistinguishable from that of materialistic communism. The improvement of man's material conditions by material means — there is the goal and that is the method. Reaction has followed, but not toward sanctity — rather to that Neo-orthodoxy which, stressing man's sin and helplessness, considers sanctity as impossible and presumptuous as secularism regards it as irrelevant and escapist. Thirdly, psychoanalysis criticises the Christian

tradition from an even more successful point of attack. Anyone who attempts a life other than that of the average, is judged a requiring psychiatric help; under the rationalization of religious terminology (which of course is itself dismissed as illusory) the patient is attempting to justify or to disguise megalomania.

It is true that many rich and selfish persons have made of religion an excuse for social hardheartedness: that some have talked about sanctity because they wished to disregard their sinfulness; that others have made of the Christian tradition a fantasy in which to express a private vanity verging on madness. But, as William James said, there is always the lunatic fringe round every search for Reality. Further, historical research has shown that sanctity has existed. Some of the past reputations have fallen to pieces under critical examination; but we sometimes forget the number that remain inexplicably wonderful — men who were genius in the most difficult and comprehensive of the arts, the art of living. We still hold out against the implications of this fact because we feel that sanctity either "dates," — it belongs to a past epoch — or it was the gallant reaction, the forlorn hope to an impossible social situation. With social service and psychoanalysis to clear things up for us there is no need to be so extreme — or sanctity can only be achieved by very rare and peculiar people, as rare as the highest type of mathematician, people capable of repressions which it would be futile and dangerous for us to attempt.

Here is a book which attempts honestly to face this problem. Can sainthood be contemporary and would it be worth while if it was? The first part of the problem is to find whether the essentials of sainthood can be extracted and so a praxis be found. In Part I the saint is considered as a spiritual researcher, one who is seeking — and not merely for himself — to find out those techniques which will permit change of conduct, character and consciousness. There does seem evidence — and it is surely both of the highest interest and encouragement for those interested in ecumenicity — that the roads of those who search for God converge. The conventionally religious may differ but for those for whom the love of God and man has become cardinal the basis of agreement seems to emerge through all the varieties of cult. In Part II the other aspect of the question, Why don't we have saints? is dealt with. The answer this author seems to find is that we won't take enough trouble. For millennia men maintained they could make gold. Their claims were shown to be fraudulent. But in our own day transmutation has been accomplished. We know now how to do it and why the earlier efforts had to fail. A completely different intensity of power has to be used. So it would seem is it with sainthood. We can produce plenty enough of what may be called citizen-goodness but "heroic virtue" — that is another matter. It may be that only when the world is sufficiently in

danger will people take that amount of trouble. It may be that that is the reason that saints were commoner in the past than now — or at least than they have been during the "comfortable generations." These surely are interesting questions, may be pressing ones, and certainly this book throws light on a number of them. The author is an experimenter of many years' standing and of a wide knowledge in many of the fields of scholarship. Certainly if ever sainthood becomes of acute interest a book like this will have to be consulted.

GERALD HEARD

A DATED CLASSIC

CHRISTIAN NURTURE, *by* HORACE BUSHNELL, *With an introduction by* LUTHER A. WEIGLE. *Yale University Press, $4.00.*

WHEN I was in seminary we read Bushnell's *Christian Nurture,* but only as a document in the history of religious education. It has been an adventure to return to it after a generation, with a more human approach.

To a critical mind in our day, it is astonishing. Its atmosphere is that of a lush romantic piety. Its English is homely and grey, save for glinting splinters of split infinitives. Its oracular pronouncements are often fantastic. Biology, psychology, sociology, anthropology must all blush for the tribute they seem to have yielded to this parsonical levy.

The inheritance of acquired characteristics is here a fact well established, and to be noted as a firm basis for consequential reasoning. There is a horrifying rationalization of racial imperialism in the weird chapter on "The Out-Populating Power of the Christian Stock." Repeated insistence on the impersonal malleability of the human infant reveals a father who had never looked at his own young while they were in the cradle, though from then on there are pleasant signs that he knew and loved them well. If there is anything funnier in print than the chapter on "Physical Nurture to be a Means of Grace," I have never read it.

With the main argument of the work one must perforce agree. For Bushnell is concerned simply to vindicate the obvious. He insists that children too are people, and that they should be treated from the first as Christians if they live in Christian homes. They need not wait for convulsive conversion in a blood-and-thunder revival. Regeneration may better be a process of nurture than an emotional cataclysm. It strikes one that in thus belaboring the mourners' bench technique Bushnell is flogging a dead horse.

But it was Bushnell who killed this horse. And he was all but cast out of the Church for doing so. This illuminating recollection redeems the book. The critic must revise his estimate.

Latter-day manners and morals are hardly better for having put aside piety along with romanticism. This English style, bleak and prosy at first glance, has a subsurface iridescence from a continuous play of apt and quaint illustrations compressed into concise metaphorical phrases. If Bushnell is now and then both pontifical and sophomoric on scientific subjects, so are most preachers on most subjects in which they are out of their depth. On matters within his depth he is a careful observer, with insight, and deftly suggestive.

The sciences upon which he trespasses were not sciences in his day. It is significant that the only science he calls by name is physiology. What if he does sin against genetics? The most controversial sections of this book were written a dozen years before *The Origin of Species*. Darwin also dates; yet people still go on reading him, because of what he started.

And so with Bushnell. Dean Weigle is right that *Christian Nurture* is a classic. The wonder is not that some of its judgments are wrong, but rather that, as he also invites us to note, "The . . . wholesome common sense of this man . . . anticipated much that more scientific methods of observation have now established with respect to the upbringing of children."

Along with these anticipations goes pervasive allusion to Bushnell's emancipating concept of the supernatural as never unnatural and always including the natural. His emphasis on that concept by itself would warrant ranking Bushnell among America's foremost theologians.

To return to this book has been an adventure, first in critical entertainment, and then in salutary humility. Yale and Dean Weigle have put us in their debt by bringing *Christian Nurture* out again after thirty years. Every generation can learn from it.

RUSSELL HENRY STAFFORD

THE CONTEMPORARY MIND

PREFACE TO ETHICAL LIVING, *by* ROBERT E. FITCH. *Association Press, $1.25.*
THE SIN OF OUR AGE, *by* D. R. DAVIES. *The Macmillan Company, $2.00.*

WE have had many books dealing, from the Christian point of view, with the confusion and perplexity of our age, but we have not had too many. Here are two more, one by an American scholar who has been a Navy chaplain, and the other by a British writer whose work was first brought to my attention by Douglas Jerrold, editor of the *New English Review*.

Robert Fitch, now dean of Occidental College, understands amazingly the mood of the modern world, especially that part of it represented by older youth. He is too wise to follow the current practice of blaming our present moral sag on "the war," for his wartime experience taught him that

war only *reveals* what the inner resources of men and women already are. He sees our fundamental trouble as a loss of deep convictions. The evil that infects us "is simply that we are acting without faith." Lacking faith in *anything,* we continue to go through the motions, most of which are relatively decent, but we are unprepared for the long pull and we are unprepared for the severe temptation. In contrast with the generation which rose after World War I, we do not, says Dean Fitch, even believe in *sex*. And we know that prosperity is really inflation. "The striking thing about our generation today is that we have lost faith in these secular shibboleths."

One of the most valuable parts of this tiny book is the treatment of our now conventional ethical relativism. The author sees this as the philosophical root of our popular and silly cult of tolerance. We tolerate all creeds because we believe in none. Especially helpful is the explanation of some of the factors which have led to this development in our part of the West.

Preface to Ethical Living is a good book and deserves a wide reading, as it will surely have. It is a shame that the publishers did not see their way clear to pricing it at a dollar. That would have increased the sale enormously. It is good to see Robert Fitch mastering the technique of the small book, but this one is a bit *too* small. It could have been one-fourth larger with great profit to the argument and with no loss in readability. Moreover, Dean Fitch could improve his titles, especially chapter titles. To call one chapter "Some Important Angles" seems to betray a lack of organization. There is real progress in the argument, but the captions do not portray it with sufficient clarity.

The book by D. R. Davies is longer than that by Robert Fitch, but it is not as good a book. Most of what *The Sin of Our Age* has to say is true, but it has been said many times in a roughly similar way, whereas Dean Fitch introduces a certain novelty into his treatment of the theme. Davies is crying out against secularism, believing that it is a "peril to all our Western values and traditions."

Whereas Fitch thinks our situation is that of people with no faith at all, the British writer believes we have the *wrong* faith, a faith in ourselves. Our secularism is that of putting ourselves at the center and acting as though God is not.

> Here then, [he says,] is the radical sin of Western civilization. It is the great sin, the titanic, Promethean sin. It is the sin of believing and behaving as though man were an end in himself; as though humanity existed in its own right and for the sole purpose of its own glory and power. Here is the spring from which have arisen the horrors that have descended upon our hapless civilization.

Davies contrasts brilliantly our mechanical, self-conscious productions with those of the Middle Ages, when men built cathedrals "for the fun of the thing." He sees the Russian experience as secularism at its worst and

holds that the only hope of Western man lies in the recovery of full Christian belief.

The chief mistake which Davies makes is the mistake of overstatement, a practice into which his hatred of Communism frequently leads him. Speaking of the horrors of the industrial revolution, he says, "There is nothing comparable to it in human history until we come to the hells of the Soviet concentration labor camps." Is his memory so short that he has forgotten Dachau and Belsen? Much of what he says about the evils of the present Russian system are no doubt true, but so intense is the author's anti-Russian crusade that he seems to be wholly unmindful of the danger on the other side. The most serious danger for us may arise, not from Communism, but from a virulent anti-Communism, but Mr. Davies does not seem to sense this at all. He is, however, a great admirer of the works of Lewis Mumford and that may help.

ELTON TRUEBLOOD

TAKING DULLNESS AND DIFFICULTY FROM THE BIBLE

JOURNEY THROUGH THE BIBLE, *by* WALTER FERGUSON. *Harper and Brothers, $3.50.*

WHAT sort of book about the Bible would best enable the layman to read it with enjoyment and understanding? Mary Ellen Chase apparently satisfied many with her *Bible for the Common Reader,* and now another Professor of English Literature has written a book of the same general type. In both appreciation of great literature is enthusiastically shared and the "human interest" element in the stories is stressed. The volume by Professor Ferguson gives much more attention to the New Testament than does the earlier book and shows more concern with the underlying religious message of the Bible, viewed as a revelation of God, not merely a product of human religious insight.

The treatment of the Bible is by books or groups of books. Some will think there is a little too much effort to be picturesque; as when the chapter on Hosea is entitled "The Baker Takes a Wife," that on Micah, "The Little Farmer on Route I," and that on Revelation, "A Phantasmagoria in White and Gold." But our movie and radio-educated laymen will probably be intrigued.

The question arises whether readers will enjoy the Bible as much as they enjoy Professor Ferguson's book. Has he helped them to undertake their own "Journey through the Bible" without him as a guide? He tells the story of Moses with gusto, but gives no explanation of the mass of legislation which the reader will encounter in the second half of Exodus

and gives no clue as to where to look for the continuation of the narrative passages. One wishes more of the Bible books were handled as is Job, where each chapter is summarized briefly. However the volume would become too bulky if as much attention were given to other parts of the Bible as to the Wisdom Literature. This raises the question of comparative values. Ten pages are given to the Song of Songs, thirteen to all St. Paul's Epistles put together. Ecclesiastes has eight pages, but there is very little appreciation of Second Isaiah and the Suffering Servant.

Some slight deference is paid to the Biblical critics, perhaps as much as the average reader desires and in a vein which will entertain him. At chapter forty, "Isaiah ceases to be a man and becomes a problem." Nehemiah "snatched the pen from the Chronicler and did most of the writing himself." In the treatment of the Fourth Gospel brief acknowledgment is made of a difference of opinion over its authorship and then the incidents are vividly retold, without any attempt to convey the purpose of the writer. All in all, however, this is probably as good a book as is available for those who have found the Bible difficult or dull. Here is warmth and color, appreciation and reverence and a great deal of sound information.

MURIEL STREIBERT CURTIS

RELIGION IN THE PULPIT

THE HEART OF THE YALE LECTURES, *by* B. B. BAXTER. *The Macmillan Company, $2.50.*

BEST SERMONS, 1947–48 EDITION, C. PAUL BUTLER, *editor. Harper & Brothers, $2.75.*

THE PROTESTANT PULPIT, *by* ANDREW W. BLACKWOOD. *Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, $2.75.*

AN English churchman, the editor of an important religious journal, has recently made a report on the state of the pulpit in American Protestant churches. He professes shock at the character of the preaching which prevails. Instead of sermons which bring the great Biblical themes of God's judgment and mercy to bear upon men who are proud and complacent, he finds moralistic homilies with negligible intellectual undergirding and no true religious base. Though there may be some little justification for this judgment it is too sweeping to be sound.

The three books under review furnish a good argument for the contention that preaching is not at a low ebb in America; that there is a sizable group of our preachers who rank with the best of the past; and that the rank and file of our Protestant clergy feel that they are at their best only when as preachers they are expounding the sense if not the texts of the Scriptures.

Best Sermons is a collection of fifty-two sermons which were written the

last eighteen months and preached from Roman Catholic, Jewish and Protestant pulpits in six countries. They have been judged "best" by very competent advisory committees, representative of the three faiths, whose concern was to find "the sermons that represent the best sermonic efforts of the great churchmen of our day, as well as to discover and recognize unusual excellence in the sermons submitted by younger men." If these sermons are a fair sampling of contemporary preaching, and I believe they are, the editor, who has read eighteen thousand sermons in the last four years, is justified in writing: "I was encouraged to see the quality and strength of the preaching being done in the church in our day. Our ministers, priests and rabbies are not afraid to talk of sin, selfishness and salvation. . . . It is encouraging to discover how much most men use the Bible itself in preparing, writing and delivering their sermons!"

Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, a teacher and exemplar of all that is best in preaching, has provided a stimulating Foreword, titled "Preaching in an Age of Disillusionment." The sound homiletic principles which he underlines are amply illustrated in the many excellent sermons which follow.

Dr. Blackwood's *The Protestant Pulpit* presents thirty-nine sermons preached in every period from the Reformation to our own day. They were chosen because "their message or method, or both, are so notable as to deserve close study by all who would increase their preaching skill." To aid such study the editor includes "A work sheet: How to study a Sermon," a carefully compiled bibliography, and a series of thumb-nail biographical sketches.

No one will dispute with Dr. Blackwood the inclusion in his volume of the work of any one of the "master sermons" he has chosen. It is unlikely, however, that any two teachers of homiletics would select this exact list. Some would give place to a few younger men of power. Dr. Blackwood's choices range in age from fifty-two to eighty-five, a somewhat awesome group of "gray spires" to put before beginners.

However this book demonstrates by indirection that the Protestant pulpit of today does not suffer by comparison with "the good old days." In concern for the abiding truths, in a sense of the awfulness of sin, in a vision of the power of a redeemed life, in a sensitive awareness of the purposes of God, our contemporaries are worthy companions of the masters of the past.

In *The Heart of the Yale Lectures* Dr. Baxter presents a digest of the most notable lectureship in America in the field of homiletics, the Lyman Beecher Lectureship on Preaching. Of the seventy-one series which have been given on this lectureship sixty-six are available in printed form. Out of these Dr. Baxter, who is professor of speech and homiletics at David Lipscomb College, has gathered hundreds of quotations so carefully selected that they give a student of homiletics the essential content and the

full spirit of the Yale Lectures, especially as they relate to the skills involved in the art of preaching. The wise counsel which some of the world's greatest preachers have given through this lectureship has profoundly influenced the American pulpit, and the stimulating arrangement of that counsel in this volume will make rewarding reading for those who would be the "master preachers" of tomorrow.

THOMAS GRAHAM

GETTING EXTRAORDINARY FAITH THROUGH TO ORDINARY PERSONS

AMBASSADOR IN CHAINS, *by* HAMPTON ADAMS, *The Bethany Press, $2.00.*

HERE we have nineteen sermons by the popular pastor of the Union Avenue Christian Church in St. Louis. Dr. Adams is also well-known as president of the International Convention of Disciples of Christ, as a member of the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, and as the author of other books.

The present volume is a selection from sermons preached during the past few years. There is no attempt at a unity of the whole, the intention being to present a cross-section of the author's pulpit ministry; but there is evident a unity of the underlying point of view: a liberal evangelicalism.

The sermons are written in a clear, declarative way. There is skill in such simplicity, skill born of preaching successfully to congregations, skill not evident in the average professor's writing. Do not suppose that the superior difficulty of a professor's ideas is the reason for a preacher's superior clarity. Preaching has to take the professor's ideas and make them flesh — this or fail. Getting extraordinary truths through to ordinary persons is an art Dr. Adams has mastered.

This does not meant that the present volume is uniformly challenging. As a genre, sermon volumes are uniformly spotty and mediocre. Something vital of the moment of preaching is missing and the message tends to fall apart; here some exegesis and there an illustration, now an arresting idea and now an intriguing turn of phrase, but little of the accumulating momentum of the original. Having said this, one must also add that for a volume of sermons, this is excellent.

Its excellence derives primarily from its wisdom. If there are occasional pulpitesque clichés, there is little superficial or sentimental. Comprehensiveness and depth of insight are evident in statements like this:

> The last word of the preacher is not of warning but of hope; not of condemnation but of conversion; not of fear but of faith. But that last word cannot be the word of promise until fear has been awakened and then refined through successive steps into awe, reverence, and — ultimately — love (p. 111).

One of the best sermons, *Set Free with a Sigh,* discusses forcefully the high cost of freedom.

> God sighed when He gave His children their freedom because of the dangers inherent in freedom. Nevertheless God gave them freedom because they cannot be truly the children of God unless they are free. God sighed, but He granted freedom (p. 186).

Dr. Adams saved the best until last. In *The Youth of Old Age,* he presents significant lessons he had learned by the time he was fifty. All who have traveled the same way will ponder with sympathy and respect these confessions:

> I have to work hard for any worth-while thing I want to achieve. The preparation of sermons has become harder with the passing of years. A minister can have no authority other than the integrity of his own religious life. There is a strange Providence that guides our lives. It is too late to start some things. By now some things ought to be settled. I love the communion of Christians of which I am a member; I love the whole church of Christ more (pp. 213–221).

HARRY MILTON TAYLOR

EARLY CHRISTIAN MONUMENTS AS RELIGIOUS ART

ART IN THE EARLY CHURCH, *by* WALTER LOWRIE. *Pantheon Books Inc., $6.50.*

THIS quarto volume contains the *summa* of an octogenarian who, through a significant lifetime, has experienced richly of religion and liturgics and esthetics and archaeology. In the early nineties of the last century, as a graduate student at Greifswald, he tramped through Baltic forests with Victor Schultze, discussing early Christian liturgy and art. In the late nineties, as twice a fellow in the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, he fell under the spell of Msgr. Josef Wilpert — and he never freed himself from that. At the turn of the century he wrote *Monuments of the Early Church,* that for over four decades continued to be the standard manual in English for the study of early Christian archeology. For approximately a quarter century thereafter he was rector of the fabulous American Church in the Eternal City, St. Paul's Within-the-Walls. Now, from a most productive "retirement" in Princeton, he has published a new manual in the same field, tersely titled *Art in the Early Church.*

The new volume discloses impressive and comprehensive excellencies not evident in his first manual. They are the virtues of high maturity. In basic point of view, in over-all organization, in enlarged repertoire of monuments, in specific historical reference, the new volume is considerably superior to its predecessor.

The author has now achieved an organizing philosophy of early Chris-

tian creativity in art. It is a markedly psychological perspective. *Kunstwollen* is the key-word borrowed from Riegl to describe it. He regards this "will-to-form" as determinative for both subject-matter and form as well. To the author's own organization of his materials this point of view contributes simplicity and a certain organic quality. The varieties of architecture and furnishings in early Christian churches, for example, are subsumed under the primitive and suggestive title "The House of the Church." Similarly his chapters on "Sepulchral Art" and "Monumental Art" illustrate the same trend in his marshalling of materials.

Conspicuous defects as well as prominent excellencies also characterize the new manual. Most evident is the author's failure to come to terms with certain working hypotheses that are currently proving to be useful in this domain of art history. The hoary *Orient oder Rom* dilemma is here discussed for all the world as if this were the first decade of our century instead of the fifth decade. The Hellenistic hypothesis concerning the earlier origins of Christian art is largely left out of view. So, too, is the North Mediterranean hypothesis concerning problematic phases of the late-antique elaboration of Christian art in Italy and Dalmatia and Provence.

In tracing the structural development of Christian architecture, the transitional importance of the nondescript community hall is simply ignored — though Richard Krautheimer and others have repeatedly demonstrated it. Most regrettably it has to be said that the author has not brought himself up to date on various troublesome issues.

Whatever may be said of his text, it is difficult to be censorious of his illustrations. From his 1901 publication he succeeded in salvaging a hundred and fifty illustrative cuts. These he has rearranged on large plates, regrouping them in a meaningful manner that is very convenient for reference study. To them he has added more than twice as many fresh cuts, that mainly reproduce the great cycles of Biblical scenes outstanding in the development of early Christian representational arts. Durene frescoes, Ravennate mosaics, Maximianus ivories, San Marco colonnettes, the pyx of St. Ambrose, the friezes of the Rossano Gospels and the Vienna Genesis — these are among the very important series of pictorial subjects freshly featured in the new volume. This vast assemblage of early Christian themes is as carefully indexed as to subject matter as is the author's text itself. It is not exaggeration to say that no other manual available today presents so many carefully selected early Christian monuments, so well arranged for convenient study and use, as does *Art in the Early Church.*

Doubtless, it is too much to expect that this manual will achieve the phenomenal longevity and monopoly that its predecessor enjoyed. However, it deserves extensive use in the immediate future.

HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY

A CHRISTIAN EVALUATION OF CLASSICAL COMMUNISM

THE CHRISTIAN SIGNIFICANCE OF KARL MARX, *by* ALEXANDER MILLER. *The Macmillan Company, $1.75.*

BEFORE reading this book, I had come across several different estimates of it. I consequently read it slowly, with care, weighing the reasons for such divergence.

Naturally the subject itself tends to bring out sharp cleavages. The author, a Presbyterian minister from New Zealand with experience in Scotland and England, has tackled a burning subject with honesty and high daring. Whatever else is said about the book, one thing must be stressed: a sensitive, concerned spirit shines through it all. Here are the reflections of a warm, large heart and a stimulating mind.

The first half of the book, roughly, is devoted to a simple, central description of theoretical Communism: historically, in key terms, and with regard to its criticism of Capitalism. In general, this is well done. I have two main qualifications of this estimate. Communism is seen too much as a separate phenomenon in theory, rather than as one crystallization, around the economic area, of broad thought-patterns swirling through the modern world. The base of contact and comparison, in Hegel and Feuerbach, is too narrow and not sufficiently used, at that. And also, secondly, there is no real discussion of the labor theory of value which, to my mind, is of key importance to the understanding of Communism. For this reason the criticism of Capitalism by Communism becomes an oversimplification of our total human-economic problem. But this part of the book is a big order and is in general well handled.

The second half of the volume, after a snack-like treating of contemporary criticism, deals with what Christianity has to say. This part strikes me as less adequate. One chapter deals with Christianity as an order of events in a different dimension from the socio-historical, at least in the main. Here the author sounds like an orthodox, or almost traditionalistic, believer slightly modified by current neo-orthodoxy. But in the following chapter, he uses Christianity in terms of our sharing God's responsible concern for the world. Both perspectives can and should go together, but the writer has himself not found the intrinsic integration between event and meaning. There is, consequently, a constant jarring of eschatological and ethical motifs. Particularly rough is his treatment of the relation of history to eternity.

The upshot of the book is that the author accepts Christianity as his faith and Marxism as "scientific sociology." By the latter he seems to mean mostly that history is economically conditioned and not entirely a matter of spirit

ual forces. What is surprising is that he treats such a commonly accepted fact as surprising! The discussion also reveals that he actually and naturally does not accept Marxism as scientific sociology in whole-thinking, as this demands: he even talks about the right to criticize revolutionary powers! As a matter of fact, he sees in Communism and pacifism — justice and love respectively — the two hopes of the future; and his heart is with pacifism as a method, though he believes we ought also to work realistically for justice in the social, political and economic orders.

All this is well meant and good for stimulation, but there are no clear perspectives of analysis nor clear directives for action. The real trouble with the book, however, is that the author has surrendered reason as the organ of truth as such. Unless reason is capable and dependable as an organ of comparison and testing, there is really no place for a book like this. Faith is, of course, primary as whole-response, whether that of Communism or of Christianity; but reason must be its constant check and challenge and the organ of profitable comparison. Only thus can the Christian faith profit constructively by the truth offered it in Communism, namely God's operation through man's economic history to effect fullness of fellowship.

NELS F. S. FERRÉ

BEAUTY HELPS HOLINESS

THE ARTS OF THE CHURCH, *by* RICHARD H. RITTER. *The Pilgrim Press, $4.00.*

ANY church at worship is a glorious presentation of all the fine arts of the world in splendid interaction. To visit solemn high mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral, to attend Choral Holy Communion at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, to go to Riverside Church for morning worship, or to visit a simple village church for morning prayer, is to confront a world of wonder and beauty.

This world of the fine arts used by all the churches of Christendom is the subject of Richard Ritter's book. Not since Von Ogden Vogt published his *Art and Religion* back in 1921 have we had such a comprehensive discussion of the arts of the church as this new book presents. Beautifully illustrated with many a photograph, it helps each one of the arts to come alive for the churchman. It is authoritative, too, for Richard Ritter is the well known leader of the Church Arts Guild of the Congregational and Christian Churches of America.

The layman will find himself at home in these discussions, as well as the minister, choirmaster, organist or church architect. Here are simple, helpful answers, touched with creative imagination, to artists who want to know about the relation of art to religion, to architects, craftsmen and members of building committees who want to know about vitality and good taste in

church building, to choristers and church musicians who are interested in the choral elements of the liturgy, to ministers who are interested in the structure of the service with its prayers and lections, and to church school leaders who are interested in religious drama and the dance. Individual chapters discuss each one of these topics.

Particularly wise and helpful is the excellent balance which Mr. Ritter maintains between the old and the new in the fine arts. He is as much at home in a Gothic church as he is in such a modern building as St. Mark's Church of Burlington, Vermont, two photographs of which he includes. He knows the values of the classical choral music of the church as well as the values of such contemporary music as that of Clarence Dickinson, T. Tertius Noble and others. He can admire a Renaissance painting fully as well as a "Last Supper" by Andre Derain.

The only disappointing chapter is the one on the liturgy and its celebration, entitled, "The Art of Common Worship." A three-fold psychological pattern of worship is presented, but the development of this tripartite pattern into the service or liturgy itself, is inadequately presented. Some actual samples of services would have been very helpful at this point. But this is a modest omission in a book full of so many good things.

CLARENCE SEIDENSPINNER

THOSE DISTURBING MISSIONARIES

CHRISTIAN PROSELYTISM IN INDIA — A GREAT AND GROWING MENACE, *by* MANILAL C. PAREKH. *S. R. I. Bhagavata Dharma Mission, $3.00.*

THE point of view from which this book is written is disclosed in the sub-title. The author, well informed in some areas of missionary literature, is apparently oblivious of contemporary missionary opinion. One gathers that at one time he was much more sympathetic with Christianity. He has been the translator of a number of Christian books — St. Bernard on *The Love of God;* Brother Lawrence on *The Practice of the Presence of God,* and Dr. Fosdick's earlier devotional writings. But he has become a fervent Hindu nationalist and his chief anxiety appears to be that the growing Christian Church will develop into a separate community and eventually demand recognition as an independent state after the manner of Pakistan.

The book is extremely one-sided. It dwells on the inconsistencies of Christians — and some of them have been and are glaring — but it fails to recognize the indirect results for good which the Christian Church has effected in Hinduism; and it gives the impression that Hinduism is entirely satisfactory as a spiritual faith. The author speaks admiringly of Jesus Christ, but sees no reason why Hindus may not adopt him as another

leader or "Guru" and remain loyal Hindus. This is typical of the vague syncretism of Hinduism.

But when one has made allowances for the obvious prejudices and defects of this book, it is wholesome reading for Christians, because it points out the wretched combination of Christianity with political and economic imperialism and the unsympathetic attitude which some missionaries have taken to almost everything in the culture of India. Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfill; and not all his representatives have shared this position. One is shocked today at some of the statements of truly great missionary leaders a century ago, who almost identified the Christian faith with Western civilization and the British Empire. The arrogance and snobbery of Anglo Saxons, both American and British, have been a serious detriment to the cause of Christ and ought to make us blush for shame. The Christian Church will be better off in many respects now that Indians are masters in their own house and no longer under English domination.

Incidentally, the book is a tribute to the steady advance of the Christian Church. Hindus would not consider the Christian movement "a growing menace" were it not so vital. The direct and indirect results are evident today all over India.

This volume intrinsically is not of great value. It is too palpably biased. Its fear of a separate Christian Commune seeking to become an independent nation is utterly groundless. Christians wish to remain members of the Indian nation as loyal citizens; indeed, only as they remain in it can they achieve their Lord's purpose for them and be "leaven." It has been Moslem and Hindu pressure which has at times compelled them to have a distinctive Christian representation in a government agency. Happily, the rapid changes of this past year have made many of the protests of this author against the alliance of government with the Churches obsolete. The Churches ask only for fredom to do their work, not for favors from government. One hopes that the pronouncements of Indian leaders will be lived up to, and that religious liberty will be safeguarded, both in the new India and in Pakistan.

HENRY S. COFFIN

CONSCIENCE AND THE STATE

HUMANIST AS HERO, THE LIFE OF SIR THOMAS MORE, *by* THEODORE MAYNARD. *The Macmillan Company, $3.00.*

SIR Thomas More may not have been — in the words of Swift — "the person of greatest virtue (England) ever produced," but he was undeniably a great man, an intellect that could produce *Utopia* combined with humor, warmth, tact, and capacity for deep friendship. Indeed, the

measure of More's greatness is more a quality of being than a sum of actions, and his ultimate martyrdom by Henry VIII of England seems not so much an action as a passive maintainence of that quality.

Dr. Theodore Maynard, an urbane and popular Catholic writer, has written a frankly worshipful biography of More, defending him against any aspersions which other biographers might hint. Despite Maynard's solicitude, More, able lawyer that he was, is his own best defender and the record of his life and thought is a noble document.

Renaissance humanists, of whom More was a leader, were "bent on bringing the Divine Spirit into every sphere of human thought. . . . It did not seem that Christianity was less true because Paganism was so beautiful." But More's humanism was streaked with a glowing medievalism. It is worth recalling that under the rich robes which Holbein painted in the portrait of the Lord Chancellor of England, More wore a hair shirt which he put aside only during his last imprisonment.

More's martyrdom took place at a pivotal point in religious history. Anglicans may be bemused at Dr. Maynard's stark treatment of the English Reformation; and it should also be pointed out — as Dr. Maynard admits — that More considered the making of Protestant martyrs to be "lawful, necessary, and well-done." But that is hardly justification for repaying More in his own medieval coinage, and a Protestant can only see in the martyrdom of More and Fisher a low point in the not very elevated English Reformation.

Modern readers approaching More's life may catch a new dimension in his martyrdom—his opposition as an individual to the capricious national state. There is a provocative touch of irony in More's statement at his final trial. More at his most medieval has his most modern relevance: "I am not bound, my Lords, to conform my conscience to the Council of one realm against the general council of Christendom."

WALLACE HAMILTON

WHOLESOME AND COMFORTING INTERPRETATIONS OF THE APOCALYPSE

AUS DER JOHANNESAPOKALYPSE, *by* KARL LUDWIG SCHMIDT. *Basle: Verlag von Heinrich Majer, Fr. 2.50.*

THE many attempts to elucidate the figures and problems of the Revelation make one hesitant in recommending any book on the subject of apocalypticism. Ultra-millenarianism is still very much alive in some quarters of the Church. On the other hand, the thinking which counteracts the excessive and unchristian aspects of this doctrine tends to subvert the spiritual values which are inherent in the Apocalypse. In his small

book here under review, Professor K. L. Schmidt avoids the entanglements of apocalyptic argument and presents a wholesome and comforting exposition of several of the dramatic scenes which draw the thought of the book to spiritual heights. The themes of the lectures, delivered over the Swiss radio on Good Friday of 1944, are the Christ as Lion and Lamb, the Four Horsemen, the Antichrist marked by the number 666, the Pride and Fall of Babylon, the Distress and Promise of Christ's Church, and the Millennial Kingdom. The treatment is only vaguely exegetical. Dr. Schmidt hesitates to commit himself to particular interpretations which might excite controversy. Rather, in rich and suggestive language, he applies the seer's conception to world history. The awesome scenes lose something of their mystery as they become vivid realities in human experience. The effect of Europe's bloodbath is evident on almost every page of the text. No doubt the spiritual tone of these lectures has brought great consolation to the suffering Church to which they were directed. To the Church everywhere, their assurance of the permanent character of the divine victory may be a moral and spiritual tonic. The message of this voice from harried Europe should be heard in America. A translation of the book would be a welcome gift to English readers.

ARTHUR C. P. HAYS

EVANGELIZING THE UNDERGRADUATE

THE COLLEGE SEEKS RELIGION, *by* MERRIMON CUNINGGIM. *Yale University Press, $4.00.*

THE American child is an object of rather excessive adulation. So, at a later time and as a college undergraduate, he becomes the object of a curiosity and a solicitude which are apt to encourage in him a sense of undue self-importance. Because he is the human stuff that is to run the world in the near future we cannot help taking him seriously — at times more seriously than he takes himself. Perhaps it is impossible to take the undergraduate world too seriously, but those three or four precious, happy carefree years ought to know a measure of healthy un-self-consciousness. The religion of the college student ought to have a touch of Francis of Assisi, as well as of Thomas Aquinas and John Dewey.

While the book in hand is not without evidence coming from the undergraduate himself as to his religious perplexities, his moral problems and his shy idealism, it is in the main an account of what the college administration is trying to do with or for him, rather than an account of what he is doing for himself.

The book is significant therefore as representing the sober seconds thoughts of mature members of our culture upon the wider issues of the

day. Aggressive ecclesiasticisms, with new skills wearing new disguises, are re-entering the academic field from which they have often been excluded in recent years. Radical movements, in the fields of politics and economics, welcome the rubber stamp of pious approval. Natural science, profoundly troubled by its own Frankensteins, is willing to make fresh concessions to the humanities. And college presidents, aware of the drift of public opinion, seek to fortify their course-offerings in the field of religion and to make more decent provision for their chapels and chaplaincies.

Mr. Cuninggim has written a fully documented, wide ranging book on these matters. He has done it by the sampling method rather than on the encyclopaedic basis. There is no reason to suppose that the results of his method do not have general relevance. He discusses courses, chapels, the denominational college and the tax supported institution alike. His more painstaking inquiries are addressed to nine of the "private" universities: Yale, Princeton, Syracuse, Duke, Northwestern, Chicago, Miami, Alfred and Denison. It is in these instances that he comes to closest range with his subject and that his findings will be most serviceable to his readers.

The book suffers, occasionally, from an instinctive tendency to manipulate facts in the interest of theories. For example, we read on page 1 "that the secularization of higher education seems to have reached its peak around the time of the first World War." But then we read on page 24 that "in the last twenty-five years this problem of the secularism of their faculties and students has represented a stumbling block to religion." We can't have it both ways. Are we more secular or less secular than we were in 1920? Mr. Cuninggim seems to be of two minds on the matter.

WILLARD L. SPERRY

PACIFISM INTEGRATED WITH BASIC FAITH

NOT AS THE WORLD GIVETH, *by* PHILIPPE VERNIER. *Fellowship Publications, $1.50.*

NOT BY MIGHT, *by* A. J. MUSTE. *Harper & Brothers, $2.50.*

BOTH these books are written by pacifists; yet it is difficult to review them together because of their widely different natures.

Vernier's little book of meditations, based on Scripture passages — mostly written in concentration camps, the excellent preface tells us — is not specifically pacifist, though congruent with pacifism. The meditations are disarmingly simple and direct yet profoundly spiritual, and full of gentle grace. The short space given here is not a true reflection of their worth.

A. J. Muste's book is one of the most incisive and cogent presentations of pacifism which I have read. In one sense his arguments are not new —

that war is immoral and self-defeating. Yet he insists with logical force that technology has raised war to a qualitatively new peak of inhuman savagery. Can any "evil" overcome by war be worse than atomic warfare? Can there longer be even pretense of a "just" war? Could our total disarmament present a greater hazard then technological warfare?

Yet his presentation is governed throughout by a profoundly spiritual viewpoint. He rejects the distinction of "moral man and immoral society" as inconsistent and un-christian. He sees the sinfulness of war to be its treatment of persons as things; that social cohesiveness depends not on physical coercion but a common set of values. Man is man only when he acts as a moral being, disregarding force and advantage, and therefore his only real defense against the Bomb is his conscience. He believes that "If the fearful choice has to be made, it is better to have atomic bombs dropped on us than to drop them on others."

His appraisal of the pacifist position is more realistic than some. The war issue, though now the supreme moral question for Christians, should not be isolated from a totally spiritualized and constructive program. Pacifism must create community by active participation wherever possible; and it must realistically face the possibility that its program, individual or national, may bring suffering. Yet (he maintains) no more suffering than atomic war promises. And an immediate call to total disarmament is the only sufficiently radical measure left to rouse moral enthusiasm or check the growth of international distrust.

He is less cogent with regard to how a pacifist state could operate; he acknowledges the necessity for police power but cannot clearly delimit its scope (p. 103); he believes we can control the course of history only "in a very small degree" (p. 80) and seems over-optimistic with regard to the power of purely moral opposition to meet physical force. After a careful, sympathetic reading I recognize much of its logical force, yet end with a strange sense of disbelief. Perchance it is only unregenerate skepticism which prompts me to ask: Can it truly be that simple?

WINSTON L. KING

IS SEEING BELIEVING?

PROJECTED VISUAL AIDS IN THE CHURCH, *by* WILLIAM S. HOCKMAN. *The Pilgrim Press, $3.75.*

ALTHOUGH the church has employed visual aids from earliest times, projected visual aids have come into the church's popular use only within the past ten years. The infancy of this method of religious education is seen in the fact that Hockman's book is the first to be devoted entirely to a discussion of projected visual aids in the church. As an attempt to fill a real

need this work could have been a significant addition to the field. However, in some ways it is disappointing.

Valuable and lucid are the provocative tenth chapter which discusses some of the unsolved problems in this area, and the fourth and fifth chapters which discuss in a practical way the utilization of visual aids. The author's sustained clarion call to the church to accept its obligation for the development of specifications for the visual material it needs is sound and true.

Yet, the book is carelessly written. Although Hockman protests vigorously against verbalism on the part of religious educators, he himself is overly repetitious. Considering the nature of the book there are too few illustrations. One does not gain confidence in a writer who occasionally gives misinformation, misspells proper names, and at least at one point says the opposite of what he intends to say.

Of a more serious nature are his dogmatic statements on debatable theories and his shallow thinking. He is insistent that the visual sense dominates the mind. This conviction leads him to deprecate unduly the value of verbal interpretation and to state that it is much more important to have color than sound in motion pictures. Rather, it would seem that the utilization of a combination of senses may be considerably more valuable than the use of vision alone. His attempt at times to make visual aids more than aids and his unusual use of some terms without explanation is questionable.

COLBERT S. CARTWRIGHT

HONORING SCHWEITZER

ALBERT SCHWEITZER, THE MAN AND HIS MIND, *by* GEORGE SEAVER. *Harper & Brothers, $3.75.*

PROPHET IN THE WILDERNESS, THE STORY OF ALBERT SCHWEITZER, *by* HERMANN HAGEDORN. *The Macmillan Company, $3.00.*

ALBERT SCHWEITZER, AN ANTHOLOGY, *edited by* CHARLES R. JOY. *The Beacon Press, $5.00.*

THREE new books are the latest tribute to the life and the achievements of this modern *stupor mundi*. Mr. Seaver, an Anglican with experience in the British African Colonial Service, a friend of Schweitzer and a student of his works for twenty years, writes with a fulness of insight that gives some justification to the publisher's claim that his is "a definitive biography." The main events of Dr. Schweitzer's life: his significant childhood, his precocious studies in theology and in philosophy, his native gift for music, his devotion to the organ, his decision to pay for the privileges of the first thirty years by a life of service in Africa, and the subsequent stirring events, all are described in the first half of the Seaver volume. The

second half is devoted to an analysis of his major writings, on Jesus, Paul, Bach, Indian thought, and from several of his more narrative writings, an essay on what seems to be the great term Schweitzer has contributed to modern religious thought, "The Ethics of Reverence for Life." Mr. Seaver concludes his biography with an excellent summary chapter in which he makes "naturalness" the key to Schweitzer's thought, life, and personality.

Mr. Hagedorn's biography is more popular, written in the narrative style, with emphasis upon events. This should make it inspiring reading for young people who may not relish the analytical precision of the scholarly Seaver volume. While Mr. Hagedorn's biography seems to have suffered little in accuracy by the use of journalistic style, its excellency is somewhat marred by several lapses into inelegance. Schweitzer's childhood pastor, for example, is designated as "the old boy" (p. 33). And the author, presumably calling upon his journalistic license, uses the name of the deity in one place (p. 168) in a manner that is subject to question. Considering the poor paper used, the Hagedorn volume is too expensive for its size.

The anthology by Dr. Charles Joy brings together almost 300 pages of rich excerpts wisely chosen from Albert Schweitzer's published writings, most of them from prior English translations, a few originally translated. Longer extracts would, in almost every instance, have been welcomed. But the compiler warns that the excerpts are only the *hors d'oeuvres* to whet the appetite for a full meal from Schweitzer's own volumes. With all his heterodoxy, Albert Schweitzer is within the great main stream of the Christian faith and shines as one of God's great witnesses.

EDWARD W. OHRENSTEIN

ADVENTIST EXPOSITIONS OF PROPHECY

THE PROPHETIC FAITH OF OUR FATHERS: THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PROPHETIC INTERPRETATION, *by* LEROY EDWIN FROOM. Vol III. *Washington: Review and Herald, $4.50.*

THIS review might well begin with an expression of appreciation of the painstaking scholarship which has gone into the preparation of this series of volumes in which the whole history of the interpretation of prophecy has been attempted. Although all of the four volumes of the series are now complete in manuscript the present volume is the first to be published because, as the blurb states, it covers that phase of the history of prophecy most likely to arouse interest in America and deals with those prophecies which the Adventists consider to have been fulfilled. Volume one is to trace the history of prophecy through the early Church and the Middle Ages; volume two is to cover the period from the fifteenth century through the age of discovery; volume three, the volume now under review,

deals with Colonial America and the nineteenth century development of prophetic interpretation in Europe; while volume four will pick up the American interpretation with the beginning of the national period and carry it through to our own time.

For thirteen years the author has engaged in intensive research gathering materials throughout Europe and America, and has amassed a large collection of original sources besides "thousands" of photostats and microfilms of sources. This large collection is now in a special vault in Takoma Park, Washington, D.C. Other religious bodies might well note the fact that the Seventh-Day Adventist Church has given large financial support for this enterprise, which is indisputable evidence that it believes that history has a valuable contribution to make toward its ongoing program.

The prophecies whose interpretations are followed through the Christian centuries in these volumes are those exclusively found in the books of Daniel and Revelation. All of the most famous of the New England Puritan clergy were indefatigable interpreters of these prophesies. These included John Cotton, Increase and Cotton Mather and John Davenport, among the early Congregationalists, and Roger Williams, John Clarke and Obediah Holmes among the early Baptists. Such early New England liberals as Jonathan Mayhew and Charles Chauncey expounded the prophecies as did the revivalists and theologians, Jonathan Edwards, Samuel Hopkins and Joseph Bellamy. Much of the colonial interpretation of prophecy was pointed at Roman Catholicism and it was pretty generally agreed that such terms in the books of Daniel and Revelation as "the beast," "the whore," "Antichrist," "harlot," "Babylon" and "little horn" referred to the Papacy. The Dudleian Lectureship foundation at Harvard College, the oldest lectureship in America (established in 1755), provided that every fourth lecturer should deal with the damnable heresies of Roman Catholicism. This the lecturers, until about the middle of the last century proceeded to do with a vengeance, using the Daniel and Revelation prophecies as the basis for their attack. Among the first lecturers to deal with this subject were President Edward Holyoke of Harvard College, Jonathan Mayhew, Samuel Mather and Samuel Cooper.

Part II of the present volume deals with the nineteenth century "Advent awakening" in Europe and traces its rising tide wherever it appeared — in England, Scotland, Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, France and Germany. The author, however, sadly recognizes the fact that the Old World Advent awakening has collapsed, due to Protestantism's confused and conflicting testimonies.

The final volume of this series will trace the "World-touching Advent Movement" as it shifted its center from Europe to North America and will

attempt to show how the stream of Old World Awakening and the early American stream converged to form the background for the present movement.

All of this, of course, is based on a bald literalism which modern Biblical scholarship would reject. But whether rejected or not, there is no doubt of the historical importance of this story as told in these four volumes or of the honesty and scholarship which has gone into the telling of it.

WILLIAM W. SWEET

BACKSTAIRS APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

EPISCOPI VAGANTES AND THE ANGLICAN CHURCH, *by* HENRY R. T. BRANDRETH. *London; S.P.C.K., 6s. 6d.*

AS a piece of historical research this book deserves high praise. It traces in detail the various successions stemming from the original nineteenth century *episcopi vagantes;* it has informative notes on those who comprise these successions, and, in the first chapter, some keen psychological observations about these men. It is well documented and provided with an excellent bibliography and index. It has a most valuable foreword by Canon Douglas. I cannot think it will be of much interest except to historians, people concerned with the oddities of Church history and those whose ecclesiastical position compels them to pass on the claims of ministers to have been validly ordained.

The *episcopi vagantes* were men who declared themselves to have episcopal orders derived from some Church whose orders were unchallenged; and who, though having no canonical jurisdiction, proceeded to confer what they claimed to be valid priestly and episcopal orders. Four major successions thus arose, bishops of which are still functioning; but all of their organizations are repudiated by the Communions from which these bishops claim descent.

As the Oxford Movement developed, increasing stress was laid upon the indelible *charisma* which episcopal ordination was thought to bestow. However, the greater the stress Anglo-Catholics laid upon this, the more acutely they felt the fact that neither the Roman nor Orthodox Churches accepted their orders and that many in their own communion repudiated their conception of the ministry. Feeling thus isolated, they longed for some way by which the validity of their orders might be assured to all who shared the Catholic tradition. A number of men turned up in England and in the United States claiming to have been consecrated by various Orthodox or other recognized bishops and, therefore, to be able to confer indubitably valid orders. Some of them were men of fine character and faith; some were unbalanced; some were charlatans and crooks. They reordained clandes-

tinely an indeterminable number of Anglican clergymen, as well as laymen and Nonconformist ministers. The organizations they founded have been of negligible importance; Anglican authorities have had difficulty deciding whether or not to recognize their ordinations; the Anglican clergy they reordained have placed themselves in a position which, as Canon Douglas remarks, is preposterous.

ALEXANDER C. ZABRISKIE

DETECTIVE STORY TECHNIQUE APPLIED TO PREACHING

WHO AM I? A SERIES OF STUDIES OF BIBLICAL PERSONALITIES DELIVERED TO THE CORPS OF CADETS OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY BY THEIR CHAPLAIN, *by* JOHN B. WALTHOUR. *The Macmillan Company, $2.00.*

PREACHING under an arrangement whereby the congregation may stop the speaker would be a novel experience for most of us. Here is a minister who deliberately planned such a set-up.

When John B. Walthour was Chaplain at West Point, he occasionally gave a sermon in which he described, in the first person, a Biblical character. Any cadet who recognized the character might stand and answer the Chaplain's "Who Am I?" The correct answer stopped the sermon, except that the speaker was allowed a few moments for a summary. If no answer was forthcoming, the talk went on with another clue.

The book contains twenty of these brief chapel talks. This reviewer commends to ministers a careful perusal of the volume: (1) to see how one man attained what is lacking in so many sermons — audience-contact; (2) to observe the result of a skilful adaptation to a particular situation; and (3) to cull ideas for young people's talks. If one is interested in preaching biographical sermons on Biblical characters, Walthour's book may well be used along with the classic volumes to build a sermon which has animation, vigor, and spiritual vitality.

JOHN H. SCAMMON

OTHER REVIEWS

GOD CONFRONTS MAN IN HISTORY, *by* HENRY SLOANE COFFIN. *Charles Scribner's Sons, $2.50.*

IN 1946–7 Dr. Coffin lectured extensively on the Christian religion, under the Joseph Cook bequest, in the chief cities of the Philippine Islands, China, Siam and India, and in numerous educational institutions.

His lectures presented essential Christian convictions, as based on events in history, as holding men under judgment, and as relevant to all the

concerns of life. This historical approach was intended to penetrate the "mental fog bank" believed to characterize many of the Oriental religions, tending to make them impotent in the face of the utterly desperate human situation in which most of the Orient is involved.

The most poignant part of Dr. Coffin's experience was that he found the Orient so little disposed to discuss Christianity as religion, and so completely preoccupied with political and social embroilments. Along with much personal courtesy, he encountered a highly critical attitude toward the United States, on the score of our inept political measures since the end of the War, our racial discrimination and injustice, our unwillingness to admit displaced persons from devastated Europe, our sectarian divisions, and in general our alleged imperialistic tendencies.

One rises from a reading of this book shaken by the terrible and chastening realization that what the Christian West does speaks so loudly that multitudes in Asia cannot hear what it tries to say in behalf of its Master.

BOOKS OF FAITH AND POWER, *by* JOHN T. MCNEILL. *Harper & Brothers, $2.00.*

THIS small book is a genuinely creative interpretation of six great Christian classics: Luther's *On Christian Liberty;* Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion;* Hooker's *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity;* Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress;* Law's *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life,* and Wesley's *Journal.* This selection of titles finely represents the choicest literary flowering of the Reformation. These are the basic documents which have most profoundly entered into the common heritage of the Protestant faith. Dr. McNeill has put the present generation under deep indebtedness by recalling them to its attention in so brilliant and convenient a manner.

OUR CHRISTIAN FAITH, *by* WALTER M. HORTON. *The Pilgrim Press, $2.50.*
THESE SHARED HIS PASSION, CROSS AND POWER, *by* EDWIN MCNEILL POTEAT. *Harper & Brothers, $1.95.*
WHO CRUCIFIED JESUS?, *by* SOLOMON ZEITLIN. *Harper & Brothers, $2.75.*

THESE three books are as different as possible, having in common only the fact that they all represent reprints or revisions of notable recent books. Dr. Horton's *Our Christian Faith* is one of the most lucid and persuasive of modern summaries of the Christian position. President Poteat's republication combines three distinguished productions into a Lenten book of extraordinary variety, insight and spiritual vigor. Professor Zeitlin's passionate repudiation of the charge that the Jews crucified Jesus is based on the contention that he was condemned by a secular court rather than a religious one, as well as being executed by Roman authority.

GOD CONFRONTS MAN IN HISTORY
Henry Sloane Coffin

As a presentation of the Christian faith, this work covers the basic Christian convictions with clarity and conciseness. Its stress upon history is an effort to render the Gospel relevant to the situations in which we are now living. $2.50

ON THE MEANING OF CHRIST
John Knox

A fresh, vigorous approach to the significance of Christ for Christian faith. This is the third volume in a series on the meaning of Christ of which the other two are *The Man Christ Jesus* and *Christ the Lord.* $2.50

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES
Burton Scott Easton

The New Testament books I and II Timothy and Titus (generally known as the Pastoral Epistles because they deal with the duties of a minister in caring for his people) have long required a new and original commentary of this sort for non-technical readers. $3.00

THE INVISIBLE ENCOUNTER
Igor I. Sikorsky

A prominent scientist and inventor, who has already written on the Christian faith in *The Message of the Lord's Prayer,* is the author of this moving plea for a present-day re-dedication to spiritual values. His argument is based on a searching study of the temptations of Jesus. $2.00

PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS
E. F. Scott, D.D.

The Epistle to the Romans for all its wrappings of ancient thought and language, is essentially a modern book, and has a message for our world today. Dr. Scott fixes our attention on the heart of the Apostle's thought and its practical bearing upon life. $2.00

THE PERSON AND THE COMMON GOOD
Jacques Maritain

A new book by the famous Catholic scholar and theologian who is recognized as one of the most influential figures in contemporary philosophy. $2.00

at all bookstores

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK